

2.27.09.

Library of the Theological Seminary
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 955 .P35 1891 v.7
Pastor, Ludwig, 1854-1928
The history of the popes,
from the close of the

V.7

HISTORY OF THE POPES.

VOL. VII.

PREVIOUS VOLUMES OF THE SAME WORK.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES. Translated from
the German of Dr. LUDWIG PASTOR, and edited by the late
Rev. F. I. ANTROBUS of the London Oratory.

Vols. I. and II. A.D. 1305-1458.


Vols. III. and IV. A.D. 1458-1483.

Vols. V. and VI. A.D. 1483-1513.

12s. net per volume.

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO., LIMITED.



THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES,
FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER
ORIGINAL SOURCES.

FROM THE GERMAN OF

✓
DR. LUDWIG PASTOR,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF INNSBRUCK, AND
DIRECTOR OF THE AUSTRIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE IN ROME

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY.

VOLUME VII.

LONDON:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LD.,
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET.

1908.

"Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines."—EGIDIO CANISIO OF VITERBO, 1512.


"Omnes nos declinavimus unusquisque in vias suas, nec fuit iam diu, qui faceret bonum, non fuit usque ad unum : quamobrem necesse est, ut omnes demus gloriam Deo et humiliemus animas nostras ei, videatque unusquisque nostrum unde ceciderit, et se potius quilibet iudicet, quam a Deo in virga furoris sui iudicari velit. Qua in re, quod ad nos attinet, polliceberis nos omnem operam adhibitueros, ut primum curia haec, unde forte omne hoc malum processit, reformetur, ut sicut inde corruptio in omnes inferiores emanavit, ita etiam ad eadem sanitas et reformatio omnium emanet." — POPE ADRIAN VI. to Francesco Chiericati, Nuncio in Germany, 1522.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VII.

	PAGE
Dedication	vii
Editorial Note	ix
Collections of Archives and Manuscripts referred to in Vols. VII. to X.	xi
Complete Titles of Books frequently quoted in Vols. VII. to X.	xiii
Table of Contents	xli
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix . . .	lxi
Introduction	3-11

LEO X., 1513-1521. BOOK I.

Election and Beginning of the Pontificate of Leo X. His efforts to make peace. End of the Schism of Pisa	15-78
The Medici and the Policy of Leo X., 1513-1515 . .	79-113
The Conquest of Milan by the French. The Meeting between Leo X. and Francis I. at Bologna . . .	114-146
The War of Urbino. The Conspiracy of Cardinal Petrucci. The great creation of Cardinals, July 1, 1517	147-212
The Pope's endeavours to promote a Crusade, 1517- 1518	213-254
Leo X. and the Imperial Succession	255-290
The Occasion and Causes of the Reformation in Germany. The Contest about Indulgences . . .	291-360
Luther is summoned to Rome. His Transactions with Cardinal Cajetan and Miltitz. His Roman Trial. The Bull "Exsurge" and its reception in Germany. Aleander's Mission to the Diet of Worms, and the Imperial Edict against Luther .	361-441
Appendix of Unpublished Documents	443-496
Index of Names	497-509



To

HIS IMPERIAL AND ROYAL HIGHNESS
THE MOST AUGUST PRINCE AND LORD

FRANCIS FERDINAND

IMPERIAL PRINCE AND ARCHDUKE OF AUSTRIA-ESTR,
CROWN PRINCE OF HUNGARY AND BOHEMIA,
ETC. ETC. ETC.

His most humble and devoted,
THE AUTHOR.



EDITORIAL NOTE.

THE favourable reception accorded to the English edition of the first three volumes of Professor Ludwig Pastor's *History of the Popes*, issued under the able editorship of the late Father F. I. Antrobus, between the years 1891 and 1898, has given encouragement for a continuance of the work.


After an interval of eleven years, Professor Pastor in 1906 issued the first part of the fourth volume of his work. This volume, unlike the preceding ones, is in two parts, and it is the first part, dealing solely with the Pontificate of Leo X., which is now published in Volumes VII. and VIII. of the English edition. The second part, dealing with the Pontificates of Adrian VI. and Clement VII., was issued early in 1907; the English edition of this second part will, it is hoped, follow with as little delay as possible, and will form Volumes IX. and X. This division of the German volumes explains the fact that the list of authorities and sources given in the present volume applies to four volumes of the English edition.

The translation of the greater part of the two volumes now issued is the work of the late Lady Amabel Kerr, and was almost completed at the time of her death in October 1906.

The Editor's share in the work has been confined to the supervision of the translation, the aim of which has been, as in the previous volumes, to follow the text as closely as possible. The notes, which contain most valuable matter, have been published *in extenso*, as also the Appendix of Unpublished Documents.

R. F. K.

THE ORATORY,
LONDON, S.W.,
January, 1908.



COLLECTIONS OF ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN VOLS. VII. TO X.

ANCONA—Communal Library.
AREZZO—Library of the "Fraternità di S^{ta} Maria."
ATHENS—National Library.

BERLIN—Royal Library.
BOLOGNA—State Archives.
BRESCIA—Quiriniana Library.
BRUSSELS—State Archives.

CHIETI—Episcopal Archives.

DRESDEN—Library.
DÜSSELDORF—State Archives.

EICHSTÄTT—Library.
ESCORIAL—Library.

FERRARA—Library.
FLORENCE—Laurentian Library.

— National Library.
— State Archives.*

FOLIGNO — Faloci - Pulignani Library.

FRANKFURT A. M. — City Archives.

GLYS—Library.

GNESEN — Cathedral Chapter Archives.

INNSBRUCK — Vice-regal Archives.

LEYDEN—Library.
LONDON—British Museum.

MADRID — Library of the "Academia de Historia."

MILAN—Ambrosian Library.
— Trivulziana Library.
— State Archives.

MANTUA—Episcopal Archives.
— Gonzaga Archives.
— Capilupi Library.
— City Library.

MALINES—Seminary Library.

MODENA—State Archives.

MUNICH — Court and State Library.
— State Archives.

NAPLES — Library of the National Museum in the Certosa of S. Martino.

— Library of the "Società di storia patria."
— National Library.
— State Archives.

ORVIETO — Archives of the Missini-Giberti family.

* The letters of G. de' Medici are to be found, *agli Otto*, in F., 30, 32, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42 and 46; those of B. Buondelmonti, in F., 51; and the writings of G. M. della Porta, in *Urbino*, F., 132, 265.

OSIMO—Archives.

PADERBORN—Theodorian
Library.

PARIS—National Archives.
—— National Library.

PERUGIA—Chapter Archives.
—— Communal Archives.
—— Communal Library.

RAVENNA—Classense Library.

ROME—

- (a) *Archives* :
the "Anima."
the Campo Santo.
the "Ceremonieri."
the Colonna.
the "Compagnia di S.
Girolamo della Carità."
of the Fabric of St Peter's.
the Gaetani.
of the Inquisition.
the Ricci.
the Spanish Embassy.
General, of the Barnabites.
„ of the Capuchins.
„ of the Theatines.
the Consistorial.
the Papal Secret (Secret
Archives of the Vatican).
of the State.

- (b) *Libraries* :
Alessandrina.
Angelica.
Borghese.

ROME—

- (b) *Libraries* :
Casanatense.
Chigi.
Corsini.
Corvisieri.
Ferrajoli.
Vallicelliana.
Vatican (including the
former Barberini libr.).
Vittorio Emanuele.

SAVIGNANO (Romagna) Library.

SIENA—State Archives.

—— City Library.

SPOLETO—Campello Archives.

TURIN—Royal Library.

—— State Archives.

UTRECHT—State Archives.

VENICE—Library of St. Mark.

—— "Museo Civico" (Correr).

—— State Archives.

VERONA—Communal Library.

—— Chapter Library.

—— Episcopal Archives.

VIENNA — Court and State
Archives.

—— Teutonic Order Archives.

—— Court Library.

—— Rossiana Library.

WOLFENBÜTTEL—Library.

COMPLETE TITLES OF BOOKS QUOTED IN
VOLUMES VII. TO X.

- Abschiede*, Die eidgenössischen ; Amtliche Sammlung I. *et seq.*
Luzern, 1839 *et seq.*
- Acta Tomiciana*, epistolae, legationes, responsa, actiones et res
gestae Sigismundi I. regis Poloniae. Vol. I. *seqq.* Posnaniae,
1852 *seqq.*
- Ademollo, A.* Alessandro VI., Giulio II. e Leone X. nel Carnevale
di Roma. Documenti inediti 1499-1520. Firenze, 1886.
- Albèri, E.* Le relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato
durante il secolo decimosesto. 3 Series. Firenze, 1839
-1855.
- Alberini, Marcello*, Diario 1521-1536 ed. D. Orano, in Archivio
della Società Romana di storia patria XVIII., 321-398.
Roma, 1895.
- Albertini, Fr.* Opusculum de mirabilibus novae urbis Romae.
Herausgegeben von A. Schmarsow. Heilbronn, 1886.
- Alfani, Teseo*, Cronache e Storia della città di Perugia, in Archivio
storico Italiano, XVI., 2. Firenze, 1851.
- Altieri, Marco Antonio*, Li Nuptiali, ed. E. Narducci. Roma,
1873.
- Amati, G.* Notizia di alcuni manoscritti dell' Archivio secreto
Vaticano, in Archivio storico Italiano, 3rd Series, III., 1,
166 *seqq.* Firenze, 1866.
- Ambros, A. W.* Geschichte der Musik. Mit zahlreichen Noten-
beispielen und Musikbeilagen. 2 Auflage, Bd. II. und
III. Leipzig, 1880-1881.
- Archivio storico* dell' Arte pubbl. p. Gnoli e Venturi. Vol. I. *seqq.*
Roma, 1888 *seqq.*
- Armand* Les médailleurs italiens des XV^e et XVI siècles.
Vols. II. and III. Paris, 1883 and 1887.
- Armellini, M.* Un censimento della città di Roma sotto il
pontificato di Leone X. Roma, 1882.
- Le chiese di Roma dalle loro origini sino al secolo XVI.
Roma, 1887.

L'Arte. Continuation of the *Archivio storico dell' Arte.* Roma, 1898 *et seq.*

Balan, P. Storia d'Italia. Vols. V. and VI. Modena, 1877 and 1882.

— Monumenta reformationis Lutheranae ex tabulariis S. Sedis secretis. 1521-1525. Ratisbonae, 1883-1884.

— Roberto Boschetti e gli avvenimenti Italiani dei suoi tempi. 1464-1529. 2 Vols. Modena, 1884.

— Monumenta saeculi XVI. historiam illustrantia. Vol. I., Clementis VII., epistolae per Sadoletum scriptae, etc. Oeniponte, 1885.

— Clemente VII. e l'Italia de' suoi tempi. Milano, 1887.

Bandini, A. M. Il Bibbiena o sia il ministro di stato delineato nella vita del card. Bernardo Dovizi. Livorno, 1758.

Bandinius. Catalogus codicum lat. bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae. Vols. I.-V. Florentiae, 1774-1777.

Bardi, A. Carlo V. e l'assedio di Firenze da documenti dell' arch. di Bruxelles, in *Archivio stor. Ital.* 5th Series, XI., 1-85. Firenze, 1893.

Barthold, F. W. Georg von Frundsberg oder das Kriegshandwerk zur Zeit der Reformation. Hamburg, 1833.

Baschet-Reumont. La jeunesse de Catherine de Médicis. Paris, 1866.

Baudrillart, A. Quatre cents ans de Concordat. Paris, 1905.

Bauer, R. Geschichte der Auflehnung gegen die päpstliche Autorität, in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, III., 222 *seq.* Freiburg i. Br., 1872.

Bäumer, S. Geschichte des Breviers. Freiburg i. Br., 1895.

Baumgarten, H. Die Politik Leos X. in dem Wahlkampf in den Jahren 1518 und 1519, in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, XXIII., 521-571. Göttingen, 1883.

— Geschichte Karls V. Bd. II. und III. Stuttgart, 1888, 1892.

— Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Bd. IV. Freiburg, 1900.

Bembi, P. Epistolarum Leonis X. P. M. nomine scriptarum libri XVI. ad Paulum III. P. M. missi. Basileae, 1547.

Bembo, P. Opere. Vol. III.: Le lettere volgari. Venezia, 1729.

Benigni, U. Die Getreidepolitik der Päpste. Ins Deutsche übertragen von R. Birner, herausgeg. von G. Ruhland. Berlin [1898].

✓ *Benrath.* Die Reformation in Venedig. Halle, 1887.

Bergenroth, G. A. Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the negotiations between England and Spain, preserved in the archives at Simancas and elsewhere, edited by G. A. B. Vol. II.: Henry VIII., 1509-1525. London, 1866.

- Berliner, A.* Geschichte der Juden in Rom von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 2 Bde. Frankfurt a. M., 1893.
- Bernays.* Petrus Martyr Anglerius und sein Opus epistolarum. Strassburg, 1891.
- Berni, F.* Rime, poesie latine e lettere p. da A. Virgili. Firenze, 1885.
- Bernino, Dom.* Historia di tutte l'heresie descritta da D. B. Tomo quarto, sino all'anno, 1700. Venezia, 1724.
- Bertani, P. Aretino.* Sondrio, 1901.
- Bezold, F. v.* Geschichte der deutschen Reformation. Berlin, 1890.
- Blok, P. J.* Geschichte der Niederlande. Bd. II. Gotha, 1905.
- Blösch.* Kardinal Schinner. Bern, 1891 (privately printed).
- Blume, F.* Iter Italicum. 4 Vols. Halle, 1827 *seq.*
- Böcking, E.* Ulrici Hutteni Opera. 5 Vols. Lipsiae, 1859-1862.
- Bode, W.* Die italienische Plastik. 2 Aufl. Berlin, 1893.
- Bonazzi.* Storia di Perugia. Vol. II. Perugia, 1875.
- Bontempi.* Ricordi della città di Perugia del 1527 al 1550 p. c. di Bonaini, in Arch. stor. Ital., XVI., 2, 323 *seqq.* Firenze, 1851.
- Borée, W.* Heinrich VIII. von England und die Kurie in den Jahren 1528-1529. Göttingen, 1885.
- Borgati, M.* Castel S. Angelo in Roma. Storia e descrizione. Roma, 1890.
- Bosch, L. E.* Iets over Paus Adriaan VI. Utrecht, 1835.
- Bourrilly, V. L.* Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey, 1491-1543. Paris, 1904.
- Bourrilly-de Vaissière.* Ambassades en Angleterre de Jean du Bellay. La première ambassade (1527-1529). Paris, 1905.
- Boverius, Z.* Annales sive historiae ordinis minorum s. Francisci qui Capuccini nuncupantur. 2 Tom. Lugduni, 1632 *seq.*
- Brewer, J. S.* Letters and Papers, foreign and domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII., preserved in the Publ. Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England, arranged by B. Vol. I.: 1509-1514; II.: 1515-1518; III.: 1519-1523; IV.: 1524-1530. London, 1862-1875.
- The Reign of Henry VIII. from his accession to the death of Wolsey, edited by J. Gairdner. 2 Vols. London, 1884.
- Bridgett, E.* Leben des sel. Johannes Fisher, Bischofs von Rochester. Uebers. von J. Hartmann. Innsbruck, 1904.
- Brieger, Th.* Aleander und Luther. Die vervollständigten Aleander — Depeschen nebst Untersuchungen über den Wormser Reichstag. 1 Abt. Gotha, 1884.
- Brischar, N.* Beurteilung der Kontroversen Carpis und Palla-

- vicinis in der Geschichte des Trienter Konzils. 2 Tle. Tübingen, 1844.
- Bromato, C.* Storia di Paolo IV. P.M., Vol. I. Ravenna, 1748.
- Brosch, M.* Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. Bd. I. Gotha, 1880.
- Geschichte Englands. Bd. VI. Gotha, 1890.
- Brown, Rawdon.* Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English affairs existing in the arch. and collect. of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy, edited by R. B. Vol. II.: 1509–1519; III.: 1520–1526; IV.: 1527–1533; V.: 1534–1554. London, 1867–1873.
- Bucholtz, F. B. v.* Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinands I. 8 Bde. und 1 Urkundenband. Wien, 1831–1838.
- Buddee, W.* Zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Missionen des Dominikaners Nikolaus von Schönberg bis zum Jahre 1519. Dissertation. Greifswald, 1891.
- Budik, P. A.* Leben und Wirken der vorzüglichsten lateinischen Dichter des 15 bis 18 Jahrhunderts. 3 Bde. Wien, 1827–1828.
- Bullarium* ordinis fratrum minorum s. Francisci Capuccinorum sive collectio bullarum, brevium etc., quae a Sede Apost. pro ordine Capuccinorum emanarunt. Tom. I. Romae, 1740.
- Bullarium* ordinis Praedicatorum opera Thomae Ripoll. ed. et ad autogr. recognitum, appendicibus, notis illustr. ab Ant. Bremond. Tom. III. Romae, 1731.
- Bullarium* Vaticanum: see *Collectio*.
- Bullarum* diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis editio locupletior facta . . . cura et studio Aloysii Tomasetti. Tom. IV and V. Augustae Taurinorum 1859–1860 (this is cited as 'Bullarium' in the text).
- Bunsen-Platner.* Beschreibung der Stadt Rom. 3 Bde. Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1829–1842.
- Burckhardt, J.* Der Cicerone. Eine Anleitung zum Genuss der Kunstwerke Italiens. 4 Aufl., unter Mitwirkung des Verfassers und anderer Fachgenossen bearbeitet von Dr. Wilh. Bode. 2 Teil. Leipzig, 1879.
- Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien. Mit Illustrationen. Stuttgart, 1868. 3 Aufl. von Heinrich Holtzinger. Leipzig, 1891.
- Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien. Ein Versuch. 7 Aufl., besorgt von L. Geiger. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1899.
- Burigozzo, Gianmarco.* Cronica Milanese dal 1500 al 1544, in Archivio stor. Ital., III., 421 seq. Firenze, 1842.
- Burmann, C.* Hadrianus VI. sive analecta hist. de Hadriano VI Traiectino Papa Romano. Trajecti ad Rhen. 1727.

Busch, W. Drei Jahre englischer Vermittlungspolitik, 1518-1521. Bonn, 1884.

——— Kardinal Wolsey und die englisch-kaiserliche Allianz, 1522-1525. Bonn, 1886.

Buser, B. De Beziehungen der Mediceer zu Frankreich während der Jahre 1434 bis 1494 in ihrem Zusammenhange mit den allgemeinen Verhältnissen. Leipzig, 1879.

Bussi, Feliciano. Istoria della città di Viterbo. Roma, 1742.

Cancellieri, Fr. Storia dei solenni Possessi dei Sommi Pontefici detti anticamente processi o processioni dopo la loro coronazione dalla basilica Vaticana alla Lateranense. Roma, 1802.

——— Il Mercato, il lago Acqua vergine ed il palazzo Panfiliano nel circo Agonale. Roma, 1811.

——— Notizie storiche delle stagioni e de'siti diversi in cui sono stati tenuti i conclavi nella città di Roma. Roma, 1823.

Canovas del Castillo. Del asalto y saco de Roma. Madrid, 1858.

Cantù, C. Gli eretici d'Italia. 3 Vols. Torino, 1864-1866.

Capella, Gal. Von den Geschichten Italie unter K. Caroli V. Fürgang. Strassburg, 1536.

Capponi, G. Storia della repubblica di Firenze. 2^a Ed. 3 Vols. Firenze, 1876.

Cardella, Lorenzo. Memorie storiche de' cardinali della santa Romana chiesa. Vol. III. Roma, 1793.

Carpesanus, Franciscus. Commentaria suorum temporum 1470-1526, in Martène, Coll. ampl., V., 1175 seqq.

Carte Stroziane, le. Inventario. Serie prima. 2 Vols. Firenze 1884.

Casanova, E. Lettere di Carlo V. a Clemente VII., 1527-1532. Firenze, 1892. (*Nozze-publ.*)

Castelnau, A. Les Médicis. 2 Vols. Paris, 1879.

Catalanus, Michael. De vita et scriptis Dominici Capranicae cardinalis antistitis Firmani commentarius. Accedit appendix monumentorum et corollarium de cardinalibus creatis nec promulgatis. Fermo, 1793.

Cave, Jean. Le sac de Rome. Relation inédite de J. C. p. p. L. Dorez in Mélang. d'archéol., XVI., 355 seqq. Paris, 1896.

Celebrino, Eustachio. La presa di Roma con breve narratione di tutti li magni fatti di guerre successi nel tempo che lo exercito imperiale stette in viaggio da Milano a Roma ecc. per il Celebrino composta 1528. Roma, 1872.

Cellini, B. Vita, testo critico con introduzione e note storiche p. c. di O. Bacci. Firenze, 1901.

- Cesareo, G. A.* Papa Leone X. e maestro Pasquino, in Nuova Antologia, 4 Serie, LXXV., 193 *seqq.* Roma, 1898.
- Charrière, E.* Négociations de la France dans le Levant (Collect. d. docum. inéd. pour l'hist. de France). Vol. I. Paris, 1848.
- Chiesi, L.* Reggio nell' Emilia sotto Giulio II., Leone X., Adriano VI. Reggio, 1892.
- Chrisstoffels, A. F.* Paus Adriaan VI. Amsterdam, 1871.
- Claconius, Alph.* Vita et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium . . . ab August. Oldoino S. J. recognitæ. Tom. II. Romæ, 1677.
- Cian, V.* Un decennio della vita di Pietro Bembo. Torino, 1885.
- Il Cortegiano del conte Baldesar Castiglione annotato ed illustrato. Firenze, 1894.
- Musa Medicea. Di Giuliano di Lorenzo de' Medici e delle sue rime inedite. Torino, 1895. (*Nozze-publ.*)
- Cicogna, E. A.* Intorno la vita e le opere di Marcantonio Michiel, in Memorie d. Istit. Veneto di scienze ecc. Vol. IX., part 3. Venezia, 1861.
- Cinagli, Angelo.* Le monete dei Papi descritte in tavole sinottiche ed illustrate. Fermo, 1848.
- Cipolla, C.* Storia delle signorie Italiane dal 1300 al 1530. Milano, 1881.
- Claretta, G.* Carlo V. e Clemente VII., il loro arrivo al congresso di Bologna, e l'assedio di Firenze del 1530 secondo il legato di Savoia a Roma, a proposito della odierna pubblicazione di una corrispondenza epistolare di quei due potentati. Torino, 1893.
- Clausse, G.* Les San Gallo. 3 Vols. Paris, 1900-1902.
- Clementi, F.* Il Carnevale Romano nelle cronache contemporanee. Roma, 1899.
- Colección* de documentos inéditos para la historia de España. Vol. I. *seqq.* Madrid, 1842 *seqq.*
- Collectio* bullarum, brevium aliorumque diplomatum sacrosanctæ basilicæ Vaticanæ. Tom. II.: ab Urbano V. ad Paulum III. perduct. Romæ, 1750.
- Corpo diplomatico* Portugaluz p. p. Luiz Augusto Rebello da Silva. Vols. I and II. Lisboa, 1862 *seq.*
- Corpus Reformatorum.* Philippi Melancthonis opera quæ supersunt omnia edidit C. G. Bretschneider. Tom. I.-VIII. Halis Saxonum, 1834-1840.
- Corvisieri, A.* Documenti inediti sul sacco di Roma nel 1527. Roma, 1873.
- Costantini, E.* Il card. di Ravenna al governo d'Ancona e suo processo sotto Paolo III. Pesaro, 1891.
- Creighton.* A History of the Papacy during the period of the Reformation. Vols. III., IV., and V. London, 1887 *seqq.*

Crowe und Cavalcaselle. Geschichte der italienischen Malerei, Deutsche Originalausgabe, besorgt von Dr. M. Jordan. Bd. II.–IV. Leipzig, 1869 bis 1871.

— — — Raphaël. (Deutsche Uebersetzung.) 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1883–1885.

Dandolo, T. Ricordi inediti di Girol. Morone. Milano, 1855.

Daniel, Ch. Des études classiques dans la société chrétienne. Paris, 1855.

De Blasiis, G. Fabrizio Maramaldo e i suoi antenati, in Archivio storico Napolit. I.–III. Napoli, 1876–1878.

Decrue, F. Anne de Montmorency. Paris, 1885.

De Leva, G. Storia documentata di Carlo V. in correlazione all'Italia. Vol. I. *seq.* Venezia e Padova, 1863 *seqq.*

Delle esenzioni della famiglia di Castiglione e della loro origine e fondamento. Mantova, 1780.

Desjardins, A. Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane. Documents recueillis par Giuseppe Canestrini. Vols. I. et II. Paris, 1859, 1861.

De Wette. See *Luthers Briefe.*

Dieckhoff. Der Ablassstreit. Dogmengeschichtlich dargestellt. Gotha, 1886.

Dierauer, J. Geschichte der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Bd. II. bis 1516 (in der Heeren-Ukert'schen Sammlung). Gotha, 1892.

Dittrich, F. Regesten und Briefe des Kardinals J. Contarini (1483–1542). Braunsberg, 1881.

— — — Kardinal Contarini, 1483–1542. Eine Monographie. Braunsberg, 1885.

— — — Beiträge zur Geschichte der Katolischen Reformation im ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts, im Histor. Jahrbuch, Bd. V. und VII. München, 1884, 1886.

Dohme. Kunst und Künstler. Bd. III. Leipzig, 1878.

Döllinger, J. J. I. von. Kirche und Kirchen, Papsttum und Kirchenstaat. München, 1861.

— — — Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Kultur-Geschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte. Bd. II. und III. Regensburg und Wien, 1863–1882.

Dollmayr, H. Raffaels Werkstätte, im Jahrbuch der kunsthistor. Sammlungen des allerhöchsten österr. Kaiserhauses, XVI., 201 *seqq.* Wien, 1895.

Droysen, G. Zeitgenössische Berichte über die Eroberung der Stadt Rom 1527. Halle, 1881.

Dumont. Corps universal diplomatique du droit des gens. Vols. III., IV. Amsterdam, 1726.

Ehrenberg, R. Das Zeitalter der Fugger. 2 Bde. Jena, 1896.

- Ehses, St.* Die Politik Klemens VII. bis zur Schlacht von Pavia, in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, VI., 557-603; VII., 553-593. München, 1885-1886.
- Die päpstliche Dekretale im Scheidungsprozesse Heinrichs VIII. in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, IX., (1888) 28-48, 209-250, 609-649.
- Papst Klemens VII. in dem Scheidungsprozesse Heinrichs VIII. in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, XIII., (1892) 470-488.
- Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England 1527-1534 (Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte, herausgeg. von der Görres-Gesellschaft. Bd. II.). Paderborn, 1893.
- Concilium Tridentinum. Vol. IV., Actorum pars I. Friburgi Br., 1904.
- Enders, L.* Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel. Bearbeitet und mit Erläuterungen versehen. Bd. I.-V. Frankfurt, Calw und Stuttgart, 1884-1893.
- Escher, G.* Glaubensparteien in der Schweiz und ihre Beziehungen zum Ausland, vornehmlich zum Hause Habsburg und den deutschen Protestanten, 1527-1531. Frauenfeld, 1882.
- Fabronius, A.* Leonis X. P. M. vita. Pisis, 1797.
- Fantuzzi, G.* Notizie degli scrittori Bolognesi. 9 Vols. Bologna, 1781-1794.
- Farabulini, D.* L'arte degli arazzi e la nuova Galerie de gobelins al Vaticano. Roma, 1884.
- Fea, Carlo.* Notizie intorno Raffaele Sanzio da Urbino ed alcune di lui opere, intorno Bramante, Giuliano da San Gallo, Baldassare Peruzzi ecc. Roma, 1822.
- Ferrai, Lorenzino de' Medici* e la società cortegiana del Cinquecento. Milano, 1891.
- Fessler-Klein, J. A.* Geschichte von Ungarn. 5 Bde. Leipzig, 1867-1883.
- Fester, R.* Machiavelli. Stuttgart, 1900.
- Fèvre, J.* Histoire apologétique de la Papauté. Vols. I.-VII. Paris, 1878-1882.
- Finke, H.* Die kirchenpolitischen und kirchlichen Verhältnisse zu Ende des Mittelalters nach der Darstellung K. Lamprechts. Eine Kritik seiner "Deutschen Geschichte." Rom, 1896.
- Firmin-Didot, A.* Alde Manuce et l'hellénisme à Venise. Paris, 1875.
- Flamini, F.* Il Cinquecento (Storia lett. d'Italia). Milano, [1903].
- Flehsig, E.* Die Dekoration der modernen Bühne in Italien von den Anfängen bis zum Schlusse des 16 Jahrhunderts. 1 Teil. Leipziger Dissertation. Dresden, 1895.

Fontana, B. Documenti Vaticani contro l'eresia Luterana in Italia, in Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria, XV., 71 *segg.* Roma, 1892.

——— Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara. 3 Vols. Roma, 1889-1894.

Forcella, V. Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edefici di Roma dal secolo XI. fino ai giorni nostri. 14 Vols. Roma, 1869-1885.

Förster, E. Raphael. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1867-1868.

——— R. Farnesina-Studien. Rostock, 1880.

Fossati-Falletti, C. Clemente VII. e l'impresa di Siena, il sacco di Roma, l'assedio di Napoli. (Progr. of the "Liceo Guicciardini.") Siena, 1879.

Fossati-Falletti, Assedio di Firenze. 2 Vols. Palermo, 1885.

Fraikin, J. Nonciatures de France. Vol. I.: Clément VII. Paris, 1906.

Fraknoi, V. Relationes oratorum pontificiorum 1524-1526. Budapest, 1884.

——— Erdödi Bakócz Tamás. Budapest, 1889.

——— Verböczy István (Das Leben Stephan Werböczis. Histor. Biographien, Bd. XV.). Budapest, 1899.

——— Ungarn vor der Schlacht bei Mohacs. Aus dem Ungarischen von J. H. Schwicker. Budapest, 1886.

Frantz, E. Fra Bartolomeo della Porta. Studie über die Renaissance. Regensburg, 1879.

——— Geschichte der christlichen Malerei. 2 Teil. Freiburg i. Br., 1894.

Frey, Karl. Studien zu Michelagnuolo (Regesten), in Jahrbuch der königl. preuss. Kunstsammlungen, XVI., (1895) 91-103; XVII., (1896) 5-18, 97-119.

Friedensburg. See *Nuntiaturberichte*.

——— Der Regensburger Konvent von 1524, in the Historischen Aufsätzen, dem Andenken an Georg Waitz gewidmet S. 502-539. Hannover, 1886.

Friedmann, P. Anne Boleyn. A Chapter of English History, 1527-1536. 2 Vols. London, 1884.

Frizzoni, G. Arte Italiana del Rinascimento. Milano, 1891.

La Fuente, Vic. de. Historia eclesiastica de España. 6 Vols. Barcelona, 1855-1859; 2ª Ed. Madrid, 1874-1876.

Fumi, L. Orvieto. Note storiche e biografiche. Città di Castello, 1891.

——— La legazione del card. Ippolito de' Medici nell' Umbria. Perugia, 1899.

Gabotto, F. La Epopea del Buffone. Studio. Bra, 1893.

Gachard, Correspondance de Charles-Quint et d'Adrien VI. Bruxelles, 1859.

- Gairdner, J.* New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII., in The English Historical Review, XI., (1896) 673-702; XII., (1897) 1-16, 237-253.
- Henry VIII., in The Cambridge Modern History, II. (The Reformation. Cambridge, 1903), 416-473.
- Galante, A.* Il diritto di placitazione e l'economato dei benefici vacanti in Lombardia. Milano, 1894.
- Garampi.* Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie con appendice di documenti. s.l., s.a. [Roma, 1766.]
- Gaspary A.* Geschichte der italienischen Literatur. Bd. II. Berlin, 1888.
- Gasquet, F. A.* Heinrich VIII. und die englischen Klöster. Uebersetzt von Elsässer. 2 Bde. Mainz, 1890-1891.
- [*Gassler.*] Schilderungen aus Urschriften unserer Voreltern. Innsbruck, 1789.
- Gatticus, J. B.* Acta caeremonialia S. Romanae Ecclesiae ex mss. codicibus. Tom. I. Romae, 1753.
- Gauthiez, P.* L'Italie du 16^e siècle. Lorenzaccio de Médicis. Paris, 1904.
- Gayangos, P. de.* Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, relating to the negotiations between England and Spain, preserved in the archives of Simancas and elsewhere. Vol. III., Part 1: 1525-1526; Part 2: 1527-1529; Vol. IV., Part 1: 1529-1530; Part 2: 1531-1533; Part 2 continued: 1531-1533; Vol. V., Part 1: 1534-1535. London, 1873-1886.
- Gaye, G.* Carteggio inedito di artisti dei secoli XV., XVI., e XVII. 3 Vols. Firenze, 1840.
- Gebhardt, B.* Adrian von Corneto. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kurie und der Renaissance. Breslau, 1886.
- Die Gravamina der deutschen Nation gegen den römischen Hof. Breslau, 1886; 2 Aufl., 1896.
- Gebhart, E.* De l'Italie. Essais de critique et d'histoire. Paris, 1876.
- Geiger, L.* Johann Reuchlin. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Leipzig, 1871.
- Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland. (Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen, herausgeg. von Wilh. Oncken. 2 Abt., 8 Teil.) Berlin, 1882.
- Geijer, E. G.* Geschichte Schwedens. Deutsche Uebersetzung. 3 Bde. Hamburg, 1832, 1836.
- Gérardin, J.* Étude sur les bénéfices ecclésiastiques au XVI^e et XVII^e siècles. Nancy, 1897.
- Gerspach.* Les Actes des apôtres, in the Revue de l'Art chrétien, XLIV., 91-120. Lille, 1901.

- Geymüller, E. de.* Raffaello come architetto. Milano, 1884.
- Geymüller, H. v.* Die ursprünglichen Entwürfe für St. Peter in Rom, nebst zahlreichen Ergänzungen und neuem Texte zum erstenmal herausgegeben. 1 Bd. Text, 1 Bd. Tafeln. Wien-Paris, 1875-1880.
- Giordani, G.* Della venuta e dimora in Bologna di Clemente VII. per la coronazione di Carlo V. celebrata l'anno 1530. Bologna, 1842.
- Giornale storico* della letteratura Italiana diretto e redatto da A. Graf, F. Novati, R. Renier. Vol. I. *seqq.* Roma-Torino-Firenze, 1883 *seqq.*
- Giovio, P.* Sacco di Roma avvenuto nel 1527. Succinta descrizione dall'orig. latino fedelmente tradotta nell'idioma tedesco dal Dr. Enrico Pantaleone da Basilea [1564] ed ora rammemorata all'Italia. Venezia, 1872. (*Nozze-publ.*)
- See *Jovius*.
- Gisi, W.* Der Anteil der Eidgenossen an der europäischen Politik in den Jahren 1512 bis 1516. Ein historischer Versuch. Schaffhausen, 1866.
- Gnoli, D.* Storia di Pasquino, in the Nuova Antologia. 3rd Series, 1890. I., 57-75, 275-296. Roma, 1890.
- Un giudizio di lesa Romanità sotto Leone X. Roma, 1891.
- Le cacce di Leone X. Roma, 1893.
- Secolo di Leone X. I.: Le arti, in the Rivista d'Italia, 1897, I., 74-93; II.: Le lettere, id., 1898, II., 625-650, III., 39-55. Roma, 1897-1898.
- Gori, Fabio.* Archivio storico, artistico, archeologico e letterario della città e provincia di Roma. Vols. I.-IV. Roma e Spoleto, 1875-1883.
- Gothein, E.* Die Kulturentwicklung Süditaliens in Einzeldarstellungen. Breslau, 1886.
- Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation. Halle, 1895.
- Gotti, A.* Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti narrata con l'aiuto di nuovi documenti. 2 Vols. Firenze, 1875.
- Gottlob, A.* Aus der Camera Apostolica des 15 Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Finanzwesens und des endenden Mittelalters. Innsbruck, 1889.
- Graf, A.* Attraverso il Cinquecento. Torino, 1888.
- Gregorovius, F.* Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter. Vom 5 bis zum 16 Jahrhundert. 3 Aufl. Bd. VII. und VIII. Stuttgart, 1880. (Bd. VII. in 4 Aufl., 1894.)
- Grethen, R.* Die politischen Beziehungen Klemens VII. zu Karl V. in den Jahren 1523-1527. Hannover, 1887.
- Grimm, H.* Leben Michelangelos. 5 Aufl. 2 Bde. Berlin, 1879.

- Grimm, H.* Leben Raphaels. 2 Aufl. Berlin, 1886.
- Grolhierius, C.* Historia expugnatae et direptae Romae a Caes. G. Parisiis, 1637.
- Grumello, A.* Cronaca di 1467-1529 sul testo a pena ecc. in the Raccolta di cronisti e documenti storici Lombardi inediti. Vol. I. Milano, 1856.
- Gruyer, F. A.* Essai sur les fresques de Raphaël au Vatican. Chambres. Paris, 1859.
- Essai sur les fresques de Raphaël au Vatican. Loges. Paris, 1869.
- Raphaël, peintre de portraits. 2 Pars. Paris, 1881.
- [*Gualderonico, Teodoro.*] Gli orrori del saccheggio di Roma l'anno 1527 descritti da un cittadino romano di quel tempo, in the Cronachetta mensuale di scienze naturali e d'archeologia redatta dal prof. M. Armellini. Serie IV., Anno XX., fasc. VI., p. 91 segg. Roma, 1886.
- Gualterio, F.* Corrispondenza segreta di G. M. Giberti col card. Agost. Trivulzio dell'anno 1527. Torino, 1845.
- Guglia, E.* Studien zur Geschichte des 5 Laterankonzils, in den Sitzungsberichten der Wiener Akademie, Histor. Klasse. Bd. CXL. Wien, 1899.
- Guglielmotti, Alb.* Storia delle fortificazioni nella spiaggia Romana. Roma, 1880.
- Storia della Marina Pontificia nel medio evo dal 728 al 1499. Vol. II. Firenze, 1871.
- Guhl, E.* Künstlerbriefe. 2 Aufl., von A. Rosenberg. Bd. I. Berlin, 1880.
- Guicciardini, Fr.* Storia d'Italia. Vol. I. segg. Capolago, 1836 segg. (the reference "Guicciardini" in text is to this work).
- Opere inedite illustr. da G. Canestrini. 10 Vols. Firenze, 1854-1868.
- Gumpfenbergs.* Bericht von Sacco di Roma, bei Gregorovius, Kleinere Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur, I., 181-265. Leipzig, 1887.
- Haberl, F. X.* Musikkatalog des päpstlichen Kapellen Archivs. Leipzig, 1882.
- Hagen, K.* Deutschlands literarische und religiöse Verhältnisse im Reformationszeitalter. 3 Bde. 2 Ausg. Frankfurt, 1868.
- Hamy, A.* Entrevue de François I^{er} avec Henry VIII. à Boulogne-sur-Mer. Paris, 1899.
- Hanotaux, G.* Introduction aux Instructions des ambassadeurs de la France à Rome. Paris, 1888.
- Harduinus, Ioan.* Collectio regia maxima conciliorum. 11 Tom. Parisiis, 1700-1716.
- Hartfelder, H.* Desid. Erasmus und die Päpste seiner zeit, in Histor. Taschenbuch XI., 121-162. Leipzig, 1892.

- Haeser, Heinrich.* Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medezin und der epidemischen Krankheiten. Dritte Bearbeitung. Bd. I. und III. Jena, 1875-1882.
- Hefele, C. J.* Der Kardinal Ximenes und die kirchlichen Zustände Spaniens am Ende des 15. und Anfange des 16. Jahrhunderts. Insbesondere ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Würdigung der Inquisition. Tübingen, 1844.
- Hefele-Hergenröther.* See *Hergenröther*.
- Heimbucher, M.* Die Orden und Kongregationen der katolischen Kirche. 2 Bde. Paderborn, 1896-1897.
- Heine, G.* Briefe an Kaiser Karl V., geschrieben von seinem Beichtvater Garcia de Loaysa, Kardinal und Bischof von Osma und Sigüenza, in den Jahren 1530-1532. Berlin, 1848.
- Hellwig, W.* Die politischen Beziehungen Klemens' VII. zu Karl V. im Jahre 1526. Dissertation. Leipzig, 1889.
- Henne, A.* Histoire du règne de Charles-Quint en Belgique. 10 Vols. Bruxelles, 1858 *seqq.*
- Hergenröther, J.* Katolische Kirche und christlicher Staat. Freiburg i. Br., 1872.
- Konziliengeschichte. Nach den Quellen dargestellt. Bd. VIII. (Fortsetzung der Konziliengeschichte von Hefele). Freiburg i. Br., 1887.
- Hertzberg, G. F.* Geschichte der Byzantiner und des osmanischen Reiches bis gegen Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Berlin, 1883.
- Hess, S.* Erasmus von Rotterdam. Nach seinem Leben und Schriften. 2 Bde. Zürich, 1790.
- Hettner, H.* Italienische Studien. Zur Geschichte der Renaissance. Braunschweig, 1879.
- Hinschius, P.* System des katolischen Kirchenrechts. Berlin, 1869 *seq.*
- Hoffmann, Ch. G.* Nova scriptorum et monumentorum collectio. Tom. I. Lipsiæ, 1731.
- Höfler, C.* Analekten zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Italiens. II.: Italienische Zustände gegen Ende des 15. und im Anfange des 16. Jahrhunderts, in den Abhandlungen der III. Klasse der k. bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. IV., Abt. 3. München, 1845.
- Höfler, C. v.* Zur Kritik und Quellenkunde der ersten Regierungsjahre Karls V. 2 Abt. Wien, 1878.
- Papst Adrian VI. Wien, 1880.
- Hofmann, W. v.* Zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Kanzlei vornehmlich in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts. Dissertation. Berlin, 1904.
- Homenaje á Menéndez y Pelayo.* Estudios de erudición Española. I. Madrid, 1899.
- Hopf, C.* Griechenland in Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit.

(Allgem. Enzyklopädie, herausgeg. von Ersch und Gruber.)
Erste Sektion. Bd. LXXXVI. Leipzig, 1868.

Huber, A. Geschichte Oesterreichs. Bd. III. Gotha, 1888.

Imbart de la Tour, P. Les origines de la Réforme. I.: La France moderne. Paris, 1905.

Jacqueton, G. La politique extérieure de Louise de Savoy. Paris, 1892.

Janitschek, H. Die Gesellschaft der Renaissance in Italien und die Kunst. Vier Vorträge. Stuttgart, 1879.

Jansen, A. Leben des Soddoma. Stuttgart, 1870.

——— *M.* Papst Bonifatius IX. und seine Beziehungen zur deutschen Kirche. Freiburg i. Br., 1903.

——— Kaiser Maximilian I. München, 1905.

Janssen, J. Frankfurts Reichskorrespondenz nebst andern verwandten Aktenstücken von 1376 bis 1519. II. Bd. in 2 Abteilungen. Freiburg i. Br., 1866, 1873.

——— Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Bd. I.-III., 17 und 18 Auflage, besorgt von L. Pastor. Freiburg i. Br., 1897, 1899.

“*Janus.*” [Döllinger and others.] Der Papst und das Konzil. Leipzig, 1869.

Jensen, O. Giov. Pietro Caraffa ag de religiose Strominger i Italien paa hans Tid. Kjøbenhavn, 1880.

Joachim, E. Die Politik des letzten Hochmeisters in Preussen Albrecht von Brandenburg. 3 Teile. Leipzig, 1892-1895.

Joanninensis, S. In Mediceam Monarchiam Pentatheucus ad div. Clementem Mediceum Pont. Max. VII. Anconae, 1524.

Joly, A. Étude sur J. Sadolet, 1477-1547. Caen, 1857.

Jovanovits. Forschungen über den Bau der Peterskirche zu Rom. Wien, 1877.

Jovius, P. Vita Leonis X. et Vita Adriani VI. Florentiae, 1548, 1551.

——— Illustrium virorum vitae. Florentiae, 1551.

——— Historiae sui temporis. 2 Tom. Florentiae, 1552.

——— Opera. Basileae, 1578.

——— See *Giovio*.

Justi, K. Michelangelo. Beiträge zur Erklärung der Werke und des Menschen. Leipzig, 1900.

Kalkoff, P. Die Depeschen des Nuntius Aleander vom Wormser Reichstage, übersetzt und erläutert. 2 Aufl. Halle, 1897.

——— Zu Luthers römischen Prozess, in the Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXV., 90-147, 273-290, 399-459, 503-603. Gotha, 1904.

- Kalkoff, P.* W. Capito im Dienste Erzbischof Albrechts von Mainz, in *Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche*, I. Berlin, 1906.
- *Forschungen zu Luthers römischen Prozess.* Rom, 1906.
- Kampschulte, W.* Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf. Bd. I. Leipzig, 1869.
- Kenner, F.* Porträtsammlung des Erzherzogs Ferdinand von Tirol, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des österreich. Kaiserhauses*, XVII., 101 *seqq.* Wien, 1896.
- Kerker, M.* Kirchliche Reform in Italien unmittelbar vor dem Tridentinum, in *the Theologischen Quartalschrift* 1859 S. 1 *seqq.* Tübingen, 1859.
- Klatsko, J.* Jules II. Paris, 1898.
- Knepper, J.* Jakob Wimpfeling (1450-1528). Sein Leben und seine Werke. Freiburg, i. Br., 1902.
- Knöpfler-Rohrbacher.* Universalgeschichte der katolischen Kirche. Bd. XXIII. Münster, 1883.
- Koopmann, W.* Raffael-Studien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Handzeichnungen. Wien, 1890.
- Körner, F.* Tetzels, der Ablassprediger. Frankenberg i. S., 1880.
- Krafft, K. und W.* Briefe und Dokumente aus der Zeit der Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert, nebst Mittheilungen über kölnische Gelehrte und Studien im 13. und 16. Jahrhundert. Elberfeld, 1875.
- Lamansky, Vlad.* Secrets d'état de Venise: Documents, extraits, notices et études servant à éclaircir les rapports de la Seigneurie avec les Grecs, les Slaves et la porte Ottomane à la fin du 15^e et au 16^e siècle. St. Pétersbourg, 1884.
- Laemmer, H.* Die vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie des Reformationszeitalters, aus den Quellen bearbeitet. Berlin, 1858.
- *Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam sæculi XVI. illustrantia.* Friburgi Brisg., 1861.
- *Zur Kirchengeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts.* Freiburg i. Br., 1863.
- *Meletematum Romanorum mantissa.* Ratisbonae, 1875.
- Lancellotti* (Tommasino de' Bianchi detto de' L.), Cronaca Modenese I.-III., in *Monumenti di storia patria per le provincie Modenesi.* Serie d. Cronache. Vols. II., III., and IV. Parma, 1862-1865.
- Lanciani, R.* Storia degli scavi di Roma. Vols. I. and II. Roma, 1902-1903.
- Landucci, L.* Diario Fiorentino dal 1450 al 1516, continuato da un anonimo fino al 1542, pubbl. da Jodoco del Badia. Firenze, 1883.

- Lanz, K.* Korrespondenz des Kaisers Karl V., aus dem k. Archiv und der "Bibliothèque de Bourgogne" zu Brüssel. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1844-1846.
- Einleitung zum ersten Bande der Aktenstücke und Briefe zur Geschichte Kaiser Karls V. Wien, 1857.
- Lavisse et Rambaud.* Histoire générale. Tome V. Paris, 1895.
- Lea, H. Ch.* A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. 3 Vols. London, 1889.
- Lebey, A.* Le connétable de Bourbon, 1490-1527. Paris, 1904.
- Le Glay.* Négociations diplomatiques entre la France et l'Autriche durant les trente premières années du 16^e siècle. 2 Vols. Paris, 1845.
- Le Grand, Joach.* Histoire du divorce de Henri VIII. et de Catherine d'Aragon. Paris, 1688.
- Legrand, E.* Bibliothèque hellénique ou description des ouvrages publ. en grec par des Grecs au XV^e et XVI^e siècle. Paris, 1885.
- Leoni, G. B.* Vita de Francesco Maria I. della Rovere. Venezia, 1605.
- Lepitre, A.* Adrien VI. Paris, 1880.
- Le Plat, J.* Monumentorum ad historiam concilii Tridentini illustrandam spectantium amplissima collectio. 7 Tom. Lovanii, 1781-1787.
- Lettere de' Principi.* Terza ediz. 3 Vols. Venezia, 1570-1577 [for Adrian VI., cf. the edition of 1581].
- Lettere volgari* diversi nobilissimi huomini et excellent. ingegni scritte in diverse materie. 3 Vols. Venezia, 1544.
- Lettres du roi Louis XII.* et du cardinal George d'Amboise. 4 Vols. Bruxelles, 1712.
- Libri apologetici* duo pro divo Carolo eius nominis quinto Romanorum imperatore. [Moguntiae] J. Schoeffer, 1527.
- Libri memoriali* della repubblica di Venezia. Vol. VI. (Monum. p. c. d. Deputaz. Veneta di storia patria). Venezia, 1903.
- Lingard, J.* Geschichte von England, übersetzt von Freih. v. Salis. Bd. VI. Frankfurt a. M., 1828.
- Llorente, J. A.* Geschichte der spanischen Inquisition, übersetzt von Höck. 4 Bde. Gmünd, 1819-1822.
- Lütolf, A.* Die Schweizergarde in Rom, ihre Bedeutung und ihre Wirkungen im 16. Jahrhundert. Einsiedeln, 1859.
- Luthers, M.* Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken, gesammelt von W. L. M. de Wette. 5 Teile. Berlin, 1825-1828. Sechster Teil, herausgeg. von Seidemann. Berlin, 1856.
- Luzio, A.* Fabrizio Maramaldo. Nuovi documenti. Ancona, 1883.
- Lettere inedite di P. Giovio tratte dall' Archivio Gonzaga. Mantova, 1885.

Luzio, A. P. Aretino nei suoi primi anni a Venezia e la corte di Gonzaga. Torino, 1888.

——— Un prognostico satirico di Pietro Aretino (1534) ed. ed illustr. da A. L. Bergamo, 1900.

Luzio, A., e Renier, R. Mantova e Urbino. Isabella d'Este ed Elisabetta Gonzaga delle relazioni famigliari e nelle vicende politiche. Torino-Roma, 1893.

M'Crie. Geschichte der Reformation in Italien im 16. Jahrhundert. Uebersetzt von Friedrich. Leipzig, 1829.

MacSwiney. Le Portugal et le Saint-Siège. Vols. I. and II. Paris, 1898, 1904.

Madelin, L. De conventu Bononiensi. Thèse latine. Paris, 1900.

Mai, A. Spicilegium Romanum. Tom. I.-X. Romae, 1839-1844.

Manni, D. M. Istoria degli anni santi dal loro principio fino al presente del MDCCL. (tratta in gran parte da quella del P. L. F. Tommaso Maria Alfani dell' Ord. de' Predicatori). Firenze, 1750.

Manoscritti Torrigiani donati al Archivio di Stato di Firenze. Descrizione e saggio di C. Guasti, in Arch. stor. Ital. 3rd Series, XIX., 16-76, 221-253; XX., 19-50, 228-255, 367-408; XXI., 189-235; XXIII., 3-33, 404-422; XXIV., 5-31, 209-225; XXV., 3-18, 369-403; XXVI., 177-203, 361-416. Firenze, 1874-1877.

Marcks, E. Gaspard von Coligny, sein Leben und das Frankreich seiner zeit. Bd. I., 1 Hälfte. Stuttgart, 1892.

Marcucci, R. Francesco Maria I. della Rovere. P. I. Senigallia, 1903.

Marini, G. Degli archiatri pontifici. Vols. I. und II. Roma, 1784.

——— Lettera al ch. Mons. Muti Papazurri già Casali. Roma, 1797.

Martin, J. F. Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suède. Essai historique. Paris, 1906.

——— La veille du Schisme, in Bulletin trimestriel de l'archiconfraternité de N.-Dame de Compassion, I., 233 seqq., 331 seqq., 62 seqq. Paris, 1900-1902.

Martinati, C. Notizie storico-biografiche intorno al conte Baldassare Castiglione con documenti inediti. Firenze, 1890.

Martyr, P. Opus epistolarum. Amstelodami, 1670.

Marzi, D. La questione di riforma del Calendario nel quinto Concilio Lateranense. Firenze, 1906.

Masi, E. Nuovi studi e ritratti. Vol. I. Bologna, 1894.

Mas Latrie, L. de. Trésor de chronologie d'histoire et de géographie. Paris, 1889.

- Maulde-la-Clavière, de.* Origines de la révolution française. Paris, 1889.
- Maurenbrecher, W.* Karl V. und die deutschen Protestanten, 1545-1555. Nebst einem Anhang von Aktenstücken aus dem spanischen Staatsarchiv von Simancas. Düsseldorf, 1865.
- Geschichte der katolischen Reformation. I. Bd. Nördlingen, 1880.
- May, J.* Der Kurfürst, Kardinal und Erzbischof Albrecht II. von Mainz und Magdeburg und seine Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Kultur- und Reformations Geschichte. 2 Bde. München, 1865, 1875.
- Mazzuchelli.* Gli scrittori d'Italia. 2 Vols. Brescia, 1753 seq.
- Meaux, de.* Les luttes religieuses en France au XVI^e siècle. Paris, 1879.
- Mestica, E.* Varino Favorino Camerte. Ancona, 1888.
- Meyer, A. O.* Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Reformation aus schlesischen Quellen. München, 1903.
- Michaud.* Geschichte der Kreuzzüge. Uebersetzt von Ungewitter. 7 Bde. Quedlinburg, 1827 seqq.
- Mignet, F. M.* La rivalité de Charles-Quint et de François I^{er}. 2 Vols. Paris, 1875.
- Milanesi.* Il sacco di Roma del MDXXVII. Firenze, 1867.
- Minghetti, M.* Raffaello. Bologna, 1885.
- Molini, G.* Documenti di storia Italiana. 2 Vols. Firenze, 1836-1837.
- Moreni, D.* Bibliografia storico-regionale della Toscana. Firenze, 1805.
- Continuazione delle Memorie storiche di S. Lorenzo di Firenze. 2 Vols. Firenze, 1816.
- Morichini, Carlo Luigi.* Degli istituti di carità per la sussistenza e l'educazione dei poveri e dei prigionieri in Roma. Ediz. novissima. Roma, 1870.
- Moroni, Gaetano.* Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica da S. Pietro sino ai nostri giorni. 109 Vols. Venezia, 1840-1879.
- Morsolin, B.* Zaccaria Ferreri. Episodio biografico del secolo XVI. Vicenza, 1877.
- Giangiorgio Trissino. 2^a ed. Firenze, 1894.
- Müller, G.* Documenti che concernono la vita di Girolamo Morone. Torino, 1865.
- Müller, K.* Kirchengeschichte. Bd. II. Tübingen, 1902.
- Luthers römischer Prozess, in the Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte XX., 46 bis 85. Gotha, 1903.
- Münch, E.* Sammlung der Konkordate. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1830-1831.
- Müntz, E.* Les historiens et les critiques de Raphaël 1483-1883. Essai bibliographique pour servir d'appendice à l'ouvrage de

Passavant avec choix de documents inédits ou peu connus.
Paris, 1883.

Müntz, E. Raphaël. Sa vie, son œuvre et son temps. Paris, 1881. Nouvelle édition entièrement réfondue. Paris, 1885.

——— Les antiquités de la ville de Rome aux XIV^e, XV^e et XVI^e siècles. Topographie — monuments — collections — d'après des documents nouveaux. Paris, 1886.

——— La Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVI^e siècle. Paris, 1886.

——— Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance. I.: Italie. 3 Vols. Paris, 1889-1895.

——— Les tapisseries de Raphaël. Paris, 1897.

——— La tiare pontificale du VIII^e au XVI^e siècle. Paris, 1897.

——— Léonard de Vinci. Paris, 1899.

Müntz, E., Guiffrey, J., et Pinchart, M. Histoire générale de la tapisserie. Paris, 1878-1885.

Nardi, J. Le storie della città di Firenze. Firenze, 1684.

Narducci, H. Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca Angelica. Romae, 1893.

Nerli. Commentarii di fatti civili occorsi in Firenze. Augusta, 1728.

Nitti, F. Leone X. e la sua politica secondo documenti e carteggi inediti. Firenze, 1892.

Nolhac, P. de La Bibliothèque de F. Orsini (Bibl. de l'école des hautes études). Paris, 1887.

——— Érasme en Italie. Paris, 1888.

Norrenberg, P. Allgemeine Literaturgeschichte. Bd. I. und II. Münster, 1881-82.

Nöthen, K. Kl. Geschichte aller Jubeljahre und ausserordentlichen Jubiläen der katolischen Kirche. Regensburg, 1875.

Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi. Vol. II. Paris, 1789.

Novaes, G. de. Storia de' pontefici. Vol. VI. Roma, 1822.

——— Introduzione alle vite de' sommi pontefici o siano dissertazioni storico-critiche ecc. 2 Vol. Roma, 1822.

Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. 1 Abt., Bd. I., herausgeg. von W. Friedensburg. Gotha, 1892.

Omout, H. Les suites du sac de Rome par les Impériaux et la campagne de Lautrec en Italie, in the *Mélanges d'archéologie*. Paris, 1896.

Orti Manara, G. Intorno alla vita ed alle gesta del conte Lodovico di Canossa. Verona, 1845. (*Nozze-publ.*)

Ortiz, B. Itinerarium Hadriani sexti ab Hispania usque ac

- ipsius pontificatus eventus, in Burmann, Hadrianus VI., 166–243. Trajecti ad Rh., 1727.
- Palacky, F.* Geschichte von Böhmen, grösstenteils nach Urkunden und Handschriften. Bd. IV. und V. Prag, 1860–1865.
- Pallavicini, S.* Istoria del concilio di Trento. 3 Vols. Roma, 1664.
- Paludan-Müller, C.* De förste Konger af den Oldenborgske Slaegt. Kjøbenhavn, 1874.
- Parvinius, O.* Romani Pontifices et cardinales S. R. E. ab eisdem a Leone IX. ad Paulum P. IV. creati. Venetiis, 1557.
- De episcopatibus et titulis cardinalium. Parisiis, 1609.
- Paquier, J.* De Ph. Beroaldi junioris vita et scriptis. Lutetiae Paris. 1900.
- 5 — L'humanisme et la réforme. Jérôme Aléander de sa naissance à la fin de son séjour à Brindisi (1480–1529). Paris, 1900.
- 6 *Paris de Grassis.* See *Hoffmann*.
- Il Diario di Leone X. ed. Delicati-Armellini. Roma, 1884.
- Passavant, J. D.* Raffael von Urbino. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1839 seq.
- Pastor, L.* Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V. Aus den quellen dargestellt. Freiburg i. Br., 1879
- Die Reise des Kardinals Luigi d'Aragona durch Deutschland, die Niederlande, Frankreich und Oberitalien, 1517–1518, beschrieben von Antonio de Beatis. Als Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters veröffentlicht und erläutert. Freiburg i. Br., 1905.
- 6 *Paulus, N.* Joh. Tetzels, der Ablassprediger. Mainz, 1899.
- Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfe gegen Luther 1518–1563. Freiburg i. Br., 1903.
- Pericoli, P.* L'ospedale di S. Maria della Consolazione di Roma dalla sua origine ai giorni nostri. Imola, 1879.
- Perrens, F. T.* Histoire de Florence depuis la domination des Médicis jusqu'à la chute de la république. Tom. I. et II. Paris, 1888 seq.
- Petit, E.* André Doria. Paris, 1887.
- Petrucelli della Gattina, F.* Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves. Vol. I. Paris, 1864.
- Phillips, Georg.* Kirchenrecht. 7 Bde. Regensburg, 1845–1872. (Bd. VIII. von Prof. Vering, 1889.)
- Piccolomini, P.* La vita e l'opera di Sigismondo Tizio (1458–1872). Roma, 1903.
- Pieper, A.* Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ständigen Nuntiaturen. Freiburg i. Br., 1894.
- Pierling.* La Russie et le Saint-Siège. Vol. I. Paris, 1896.

- Pighi, G. B.* Gianmatteo Giberti, vescovo di Verona. Verona, 1900.
- Piper, F.* Mythologie der christlichen Kunst von der ältesten Zeit bis ins 16. Jahrhundert. 2 Bde. Gotha, 1847-1851.
- Pitti, J.* Istoria Fiorentina dal 1215 al 1529 pubbl. da F. L. Polidori, in Archivio stor. Ital. Vol. I. Firenze, 1842.
- Planitz, H. v. d.* Berichte aus dem Reichsregiment in Nürnberg 1521-1523, gesammelt von E. Wülcker, herausgeg. von H. Virck. Leipzig, 1898.
- Plon, E.* B. Cellini orfèvre, médailleur, sculpteur. Recherches sur sa vie, sur son œuvre et sur les pièces qui lui sont attribuées. Paris, 1883.
- Pocock, N.* Records of the Reformation. The Divorce. 1527-1533. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1870.
- Prato, Giov. Andrea.* Storia di Milano, in Archivio stor. Ital. III. Firenze, 1842.
- Professione, A.* Dalla battaglia di Pavia al sacco di Roma. Verona, 1890.
- Dal trattato di Madrid al sacco di Roma. Verona, 1892.
- Prove, L.* Nikolaus Copernicus. 2 Bde. (Bd. II. Urkunden). Berlin, 1883-1884.
- Pungileoni.* Memorie intorno alla vita di D. Bramante. Roma, 1836.
- Quartalschrift, Römische,* für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte. Herausgeg. von A. de Waal, H. Finke und S. Ehses. Jahrgang I. seqq. Rom, 1887 seqq.
- Quellen und Forschungen* aus italienischen Bibliotheken und Archiven. Herausgeg. von dem preuss. histor.-Institut. Bd. I. seqq. Rom, 1898 seqq.
- Ranke, L. v.* Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. 6 Bde., 5 Aufl. Leipzig, 1873.
- Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten. Bd. I. und III., 6 Aufl. Leipzig, 1874.
- Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtschreiber. 2 Aufl. Leipzig 1874.
- Historisch-biographische Studien. Leipzig, 1877.
- Ratti.* Lettera al sig. C. Fea sul di lui parallelo di Giulio II. con Leone X. Roma, 1822.
- Raumer, Fr. v.* Briefe aus Paris zur Erläuterung der Geschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Bd. I. Leipzig, 1831.
- Raynaldus, O.* Annales ecclesiastici. Tom. XII., XIII. Lucae, 1754-1755.
- Razzi, D. S.* Vita di P. Soderini gonfaloniere della Rep. Fiorent. Padova, 1737.

- Redlich, O.* Der Reichstag von Nürnberg 1522-1523. Leipzig, 1887.
- Redtenbacher, R.* Architektur der italienischen Renaissance. Frankfurt, 1886.
- Regesta Leonis X. P. M.* e tabularii Vaticani manuscriptis voluminibus coll. et ed. J. Hergenröther. Fasc. I.-VIII. Friburgi Brisg., 1884-1891.
- Reichstagsakten, Deutsche.* Jüngere Serie. Herausgeg. durch die Histor. Kommission bei der bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. I. *seqq.* Gotha, 1893 *seqq.*
- Reissner, Ad.* Historia Herrn Georgen und Herrn Kasparn. von Frundsberg. Frankfurt, 1572.
- Remling, F. X.* Geschichte der Bischöfe von Speyer. Bd. II. Mainz, 1854.
- Renazzi, F. M.* Storia dell' Università degli studi di Roma, detta la Sapienza, con un saggio storico d. letteratura Romano del secolo XIII. sino al secolo XVIII. 2 Vols. Roma, 1803-1804.
- Renier, R.* Notizia di lettere inedite del conte Bald. Castiglione. Torino, 1889. (*Nozze-publ.*)
- Retzer, J. v.* Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften des ehemaligen Bischofs von Gurk Hieronymus Balbi. Wien, 1790.
- Reumont, A. v.* Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte. 6 Bde. Berlin, 1853-1857.
- Die Jugend der Katharina von Medici. Berlin, 1854. (2nd Edition, Berlin, 1856.)
- Kardinal Wolsey und der Heilige Stuhl, in den Beiträgen zur italienischen, Geschichte III., 1-101. Berlin, 1855.
- Geschichte der Stadt Rom. Bd. II. und III. Berlin, 1867-1870.
- Geschichte Toskanas. I. Teil. Gotha, 1876.
- Vittoria Colonna. Freiburg i. Br., 1881.
- Reusens.* Syntagma doctrinae theolog. Adriana VI. Lovanii, 1861.
- Richard, P.* Une correspondance diplomatique de la curie romaine à la veille de Marignan, in Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse, IX., 6 *seqq.*, 104 *seqq.*, 321 *seqq.* Paris, 1904.
- Richter.* Der Reichstag zu Nürnberg 1524. Leipziger Dissertation. Leipzig, *s. a.*
- *J. P.* The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci. London, 1883.
- Riezler, S.* Geschichte Bayerns. Bd. IV. Gotha, 1899.
- Riffel, C.* Christliche Kirchengeschichte der neuesten Zeit seit dem Anfange der grossen Glaubens und Kirchenspaltung. Bd. I. (2 Aufl.), II., und III. Mainz, 1842-1846.

Rio, A. F. Michel-Ange et Raphaël. Avec un supplément sur la décadence de l'école romaine. Paris, 1867.

Robert, U. Philibert de Chalon, prince d'Orange. Paris, 1902.

——— Philibert de Chalon. Lettres et documents. Paris, 1902.

Rodocanachi, E. Le Capitole Romain antique et moderne. Paris, 1904.

Romanin. Storia documentata di Venezia. Vol. IV. Venezia, 1855.

Romano, G. Cronaca del soggiorno di Carlo V. in Italia. Milano, 1892.

Roscoe, G. Vita e pontificato di Leone X. con annotazioni e documenti inediti di L. Bossi. 12 Vols. Milano, 1816 *seqq.*

——— Leben und Regierung des Papstes Leo X., übersetzt von Glaser, mit Anmerkungen von Heuke. 3 Bde. Wien, 1818 *seq.*

Rossi, A. Francesco Guicciardini e il governo Fiorentino dal 1527 al 1540. 2 Vols. Bologna, 1896–1899.

Rossi, V. Pasquinate di Pietro Aretino ed anonime per il conclave e l'elezione di Adriano VI. Palermo, 1891.

——— Storia letteraria d'Italia. Il Quattrocento. Milano, 1898.

Rumohr, C. F. v. Italienische Forschungen. 3 Teile. Berlin und Settin, 1827–1831.

Ruth, E. Geschichte der italienischen Poesie. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1844.

Sabbadini, R. Storia del Ciceronianismo. Torino, 1886.

Sadoleti, J. Epistolae Leonis X., Clementis VII., et Pauli III. nomine scriptae. Romae, 1759.

Sägmmüller, J. B. Die Papstwahlen und die Staaten von 1447 bis 1555. Tübingen, 1890.

Salvioli, G. Nuovi studi sulla politica e le vicende dell'esercito imperiale in Italia nel 1526–1527 e sul sacco di Roma, in Archivio Veneto, XVI., 272–298; XVII., 1–34. Venezia, 1878–1879.

Sandoval, P. de. Vida y hechos del emperador Carlos Quinto. 2 Vols. Pamplona, 1634.

Santoni, M. I primordi dei frati Cappuccini nel ducato di Camerino. Camerino, 1899.

Santoro, Leonardo da Caserta. Dei successi del sacco di Roma e guerra del regno di Napoli sotto Lotrech. Napoli, 1858.

Sanuto, M. I Diarii. Tom. XVI.–LVIII. Venezia, 1886–1903.

Schaden. See *Thiersch*.

Schäfer. Geschichte Portugals. 5 Bde. Hamburg, 1836–1854.

——— *D.* Geschichte von Dänemark. Bd. IV. Gotha, 1893.

Schärtlins von Burtenbach. Lebenbeschreibung, aus dessen

- eigenen und Geschlechts - Nachrichten. Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1777.
- Schelle*. Die päpstliche Sängerschule. Wien, 1872.
- Schmidlin, J.* Geschichte der deutschen Nationalkirche in Rom S. Maria dell' Anima. Freiburg i. Br., 1906.
- Schmidt, E. A.* Geschichte von Frankreich. Bd. I.-IV. (Geschichte der europäischen Staaten, herausgeg. von Heeren und Ukert). Hamburg, 1835-1848.
- Schönfeld, A.* Andrea Sansovino und seine Schule. Stuttgart, 1881.
- Schück, J.* Aldus Manutius und seine Zeitgenossen in Italien und Deutschland. Berlin, 1862.
- Schulte, A.* Die Fugger in Rom 1495-1523. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1904.
- Schulz, H.* Der Sacco di Roma. Karls V. Truppen in Rom 1527-1528. Halle, 1894.
- Segni*. Storie Fiorentine, ed. Gargani. Firenze, 1857.
- Selbstbiographie* Raffaels von Montelupo, bei Reumont, Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte, III., 416 seqq. Berlin, 1855.
- Semper, Schulze und Barth.* Carpi. Ein Fürstensitz der Renaissance. Dresden, 1882.
- Sepulveda, J. G.* De rebus gestis Caroli V., in Opera accur. regia hist. academia. Tom. I. et II. Matriti, 1780.
- Serassi, P. A.* Lettere del conte B. Castiglione pubbl. de P. A. S. 2 Vols. Padova, 1769-1771.
- Sismondi, J. S.* Geschichte der italienischen Freystaaten im Mittelalter. Aus dem Französischen. 11-14 Teil. Zürich, 1820.
- Soldan, W. G.* Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1855.
- Spahn, M.* Joh. Cochläus. Ein Lebensbild aus dem zeitalter der Kirchenspaltung. Berlin, 1898.
- Springer, A.* Raffael und Michelangelo. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1878; 2 Aufl. 1883.
- Staffetti, L.* Il cardinale Innoc. Cybo. Firenze, 1894.
- State Papers* published under the authority of Her Majesty's Commission. King Henry VIII. Part V: Foreign Correspondence. Vol. VI. (1473[1509]-1527); Vol. VII. (1527-1537). London, 1849.
- Staudenmaier, F. A.* Geschichte der Bischofswahlen. Tübingen, 1830.
- Steinmann, E.* Die Sixtinische Kapelle. 2 Bde. München, 1891-96.
- Rom in der Renaissance. 2 Aufl. Leipzig, 1902.
- Stoegmann, K.* Ueber die Briefe des Andrea da Burgo, Gesandten Königs Ferdinands, an den Kardinal und Bischof von Trient Bernhard Cles; in the Sitzungsberichten der

- Weiner Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-histor. Klasse, XXIV., 159-253. Wien, 1857.
- Strauss, D. F.* Ulrich von Hutten. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1858.
- Strzygowski, J.* Das Werden des Barock bei Raphael und Correggio. Nebst einem Anhang über Rembrandt. Strassburg, 1898.
- Studi e documenti* di storia e diritto. Pubblicazione periodica dell'accademia di conferenze storico-giuridiche. A° 1 *seqq.* Roma, 1880 *seqq.*
- Sudendorf, H.* Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte. 3 Teile. Berlin, 1851-1854.
- Sugenheim, S.* Bayerns politische Geschichte. Bd. I. München, 1816.—Urkunden zum ersten Bande von Bayerns politischer Geschichte. München, 1817.
- Frankreichs Einfluss auf und Beziehungen zu Deutschland seit der Reformation bis zur ersten französischen Staatsumwälzung. Bd. I. Stuttgart, 1845.
- Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates. Leipzig, 1854.
- Szalav.* Geschichte Ungarns. Deutsch von Wögerer. 3 Bde. Pest, 1866-1874.
- Szamatolski, S.* Ulrichs von Hutten deutsche Schriften. Untersuchungen nebst einer Nachlese. Strassburg, 1891.
- Theiner, A.* Schweden und seine Stellung zum Heiligen Stuhl unter Johann III., Sigmund III. und Karl X. 2 Bde. Augsburg, 1838.
- Vetera Monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia. Tom. II. (1352-1526). Romae, 1860.
- Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis. Tom. II. (1410-1572). Romae, 1861.
- Codex diplomaticus domini temporalis S. Sedis. Recueil de documents pour servir à l'histoire du gouvernement temporel des états du Saint-Siège extraits des archives du Vatican. Tom. III. (1389-1793). Rome, 1862.
- Vetera Monumenta Slavorum meridionalium historiam illustrantia. Tom. I.-II. Zagrabiae, 1875.
- Thiersch, H. W. J.* Erinnerungen an Emil August von Schaden. Frankfurt a. M. und Erlangen, 1853.
- Thurston, H.* The Holy Year of Jubilee. An Account of the History and Ceremonial of the Roman Jubilee. London, 1900.
- Ticknor, G.* Geschichte der spanischen Literatur. Leipzig, 1867.
- Tiraboschi, Girolamo.* Biblioteca Modenese. 6 Vols. Modena, 1781-1786.

- Tiraboschi, Girolamo.* Storia della letteratura Italiana. Vols. V.—VII. Roma, 1783.
- Tolomei, E.* La Nunziatura di Venezia nel pontificato di Clemente VII. Torino, 1892.
- Torrigio, F. M.* Le sacre grotte Vaticane. Roma, 1639.
- Tschackert, P.* Die Päpste der Renaissance. Heidelberg, 1879.
- Tuccia, N. della.* Cronaca di Viterbo. Cronache e statuti della città di Viterbo pubblicati ed illustrati da Ignazio Ciampi. Firenze, 1872.
- Uebersberger, H.* Oesterreich und Russland seit dem Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts. Auf Veranlassung S. D. des Fürsten Franz von und zu Liechtenstein dargestellt. Bd. I.: 1488–1606. Wien, 1906.
- Ughelli, F.* Italia sacra, sive de episcopis Italiae et insularum adiacentium rebusque ab iis gestis opus. Romae, 1664 *seq.* Editio II., ed. N. Coletus. 10 Tom. Venetiis, 1717–1722.
- Ugolini, Fil.* Storia dei conti e dei duchi d'Urbino. Vols. I. and II. Firenze, 1859.
- Ulmann, H.* Kaiser Maximilians I. Absichten auf das Papsttum in den Jahren 1507–1511. Stuttgart, 1888.
- Studien zur Geschichte des Papstes Leo X. I. und II. in Quiddes Deutscher Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft X., 2, 1–13, und XI., 90–113. Freiburg i. Br., 1893.
- Varchi, B.* Storia Fiorentina ed. M. Santorio. 2 Vols. Milano, 1845–1846.
- Vasari, G.* Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori. Firenze, Le Monnier, 1846 *seqq.* (Nuova ediz. di G. Milanesi, Firenze, 1878 *seqq.*)
- Vast, H.* De vita et operibus J. Lascaris. Paris, 1878.
- Venuti, R.* Oratio habita Romae in aedibus Capitolinis 11. Maii 1521 ab anonymo auctore die, qua dedicata fuit marmorea Leonis X. statua, notis illustrata a R. Ven. Romae, 1735.
- Verdi, A.* Gli ultimi anni di Lorenzo de' Medici, duca d'Urbino 1515–1519. Este, 1889.
- Vertot.* Histoire des chevaliers hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem. 5 Vols. Paris, 1727.
- Vettori, Fr.* Sommario della storia d'Italia dal 1511 al 1527, ed. Reumont in Archivio storico Italiano, Append. VI. B, pp. 261–387.
- Villa, A. R.* Italia desde la batalla de Pavia hasta el saco de Roma. Madrid, 1885.
- Memorias para la historia del asalto y saco de Roma en 1527. Madrid, 1875.

- Villari, P.* Nicolò Machiavelli und seine Zeit. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1877-1883. (2^a ediz. Ital. Milano, 1895-1896.)
- Virck, H.* Politische Korrespondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation. Bd. I.: 1517-1530. Strassburg, 1882.
- Virgili, A.* Francesco Berni. Firenze, 1881.
- [*Vitali, Francesco Antonio.*] Memorie storiche de' tesorieri generali pontificj. Napoli, 1782.
- Vogelstein, H., und Rieger.* Geschichte der Juden in Rom. 2 Bde. Berlin, 1895-1896.
- Volpicella, Scip.* Studi di letteratura, storia ed arti. Napoli, 1876.
- Voltelini, H. v.* Die Bestrebungen Maximilians I. um die Kaiserkrone 1518, in the Mittheilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung, XI., 41-86, 574-626. Innsbruck, 1890.
- Waagen, G. F.* Kunstwerke und Künstler in England. 1 Teil. Berlin, 1837.
- Waal, A. de.* Der Campo Santo der Deutschen zu Rom. Geschichte der nationalen Stiftung. Freiburg i. Br., 1896.
- Wadding, L.* Annales Minorum seu trium ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum. Edit. secunda, opera et studio R^{mi} P. Josephi Mariae Fonseca ab Ebor. Tom. XIV. und XV. Romae, 1735 seqq.
- Weidling, J.* Schwedische Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Gotha, 1882.
- Weiss, Ch.* Papiers d'état du cardinal de Granvelle d'après les manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Besançon. Vols. I.-IV. Paris, 1841-1848.
- Wensing, J. H.* Het leven van Adrian VI. Utrecht, 1870.
- Werner, H.* Die Flugschrift "Onus ecclesiae" (1519) mit einem Anhang über sozial und kirchenpolitische Prophetien. Giessen, 1901.
- *K.* Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie. Bd. IV. Schaffhausen, 1865.
- Wiedemann, Th.* Johann Eck. Regensburg, 1865.
- Wirz, C.* Ennio Filonardi, der letzte Nuntius in Zürich. Zürich, 1894.
- Akten über die diplomatischen Beziehungen der römischen Kurie zu der Schweiz 1512-1552 (Quellen zur Schweizergeschichte Bd. XVI.). Basel, 1895.
- Bullen und Breven aus italienischen Archiven 1116-1623 (Quellen zur Schweizergeschichte Bd. XXI.). Basel, 1902.
- Wölfflin, H.* Die klassische Kunst. München, 1899.

Woltmann. Geschichte der Malerei. Fortgesetzt von Woermann.
Bd. II. Leipzig, 1882.

Wolzogen, A. Rafael Santi. Sein Leben und seine Werke.
Leipzig, 1865.

Zimmermann, M. G. Das Zeitalter der Renaissance. Bd. II.
von Knackfuss-Zimmermann, Allgemeine Kunstgeschichte.
2, unveränderte Aufl. Bielefeld, 1906.

Zinkeisen, J. M. Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa.
1 Teile. Gotha, 1840-1854.

Zurita, G. Anales de la corona de Aragon. Vols. IV., V.
Zaragoza, 1610.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII.*

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
The work of Julius II. Character of Leo X.	3
Many attempts at Reform, but without decisive results	4
Cry for Reform from both sides of the Alps	4
Optimism of Leo X., who disregards the warnings from Germany, and becomes absorbed in politics	5
Increase of prophetic utterances and notes of warning	5
Prediction of Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola	6
Sigismondo Tizio's letter about the Pope	6
Importance of the anti-Papal movement not realized by Leo, but grasped at once by his successor Adrian VI.	7
Adrian, the first Pope to indicate what was to be done	8
Many good qualities of Clement VII., but he lost courage	8
Disastrous results of Clement's pontificate	9
"Men must be changed by religion, and not religion by men"	10
The Oratory of Divine Love	10
New religious orders	11
The silent growth and hidden beginnings of the true Reformation	11

CHAPTER I.

ELECTION AND BEGINNING OF THE PONTIFICATE OF LEO X.— HIS EFFORTS TO MAKE PEACE.—END OF THE SCHISM OF PISA.

A.D.

1513 Members of the Sacred College at the time of the death of Julius II.	15
Discussions as to the Papal election	16
Exclusion of the Schismatic Cardinals	17

* Unpublished documents are marked by an asterisk (*); documents to be published in "Acta Pontificum Romanorum" are designated by two asterisks (**).

A.D.		PAGE
1513	Opening of the Conclave	18
	Public and secret articles of the election capitulation .	19
	Bull of Julius II. against simony read. The first scrutiny	21
	Causes that commended Medici to the electors .	23
	Riario and Bakócz his most formidable opponents .	24
	The election effected without simony	25
	Popularity of the election in Rome	25
	Opinion of the Swiss Envoy, Peter Falk	26
	Unbounded satisfaction in Florence	27
	The election received favourably by European princes, even by Louis XII. of France	27
	Early life and education of Leo	28
	His devotion to art and generosity to the learned .	30
	Distinguished by his dignity and decorum	31
	His career during the closing years of the pontificate of Julius II.	31
	Leo ordained priest, 15th of March, and consecrated Bishop on the 17th	33
	Coronation by Cardinal Farnese	33
	The many and exorbitant demands for favours . . .	33
	Leo performs the ceremonies of Holy week with great recollection	34
	Removes the tax on wine and flour	35
	Extensive preparations for the ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran	35
	The censures on the Duke of Ferrara removed . . .	36
	Magnificence and incidents of the procession to the Lateran	37
	Mixture of religious and pagan decorations and inscriptions	40
	Humanists proclaim the arrival of the Golden Age .	42
	The first measures of Leo X. Desire for peace . .	43
	His forbearance towards the schismatic Cardinals .	44
	Difficulties in his political efforts to make peace .	45
	Treaty of France with Venice	46
	The Pope urged to declare himself openly against France	46
	Warns Venice against an alliance with France . . .	47
	Louis XII. endeavours to gain the support of the Pope	47
	The condition of Milan under Maximilian Sforza, who turns for help to Leo	48
	Representations of Morone and Schinner on the danger of French supremacy in Lombardy .	49
	Formation of the Holy League	50
	Hesitation of the Pope to side openly against France	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xliii

A.D.		PAGE
1513	The French commence hostilities	52
	The Swiss defeat the French at Novara	52
	Leo exhorts the victors to peace in view of the danger from the Turks	53
	France adheres to the Council of the Lateran	54
	End of the schism a consequence of Novara	54
	The Pope urges gentleness rather than severity	55
	Abjuration of Carvajal and Sanseverino	57
	Leo's attitude towards France changes	59
	Obstinacy of Venice; the Pope agrees to the Emperor's demand to send Papal troops against the Republic	60
	The Venetians adhere to their demand for Verona and Vicenza	61
	Venice turns a deaf ear to the Pope's exhortations	62
	Defeat of the French at Guinegate	62
	L. Campeggio sent as Nuncio to Maximilian; his instructions	63
	The Spanish viceroy attacks Venice	64
	Venice gives the Pope full power to make peace	65
	Leo negotiates between the belligerents	65
	Louis XII. sends an envoy to Rome	66
	France repudiates the Pisan Council and appoints representatives to that of the Lateran	67
	The <i>obedientia</i> of the Emperor	68
	Pretensions of Lang, the Emperor's representative	69
	Solemn Session (the 8th) of the Lateran Council	71
	Publication of important Bulls relating to Reform, a Crusade, the Bohemians and peace	72
	Spectacles in connection with the reception of envoys	73
1514	Sensation caused by the Embassy from Portugal	74
	The white elephant, the talk of Rome	75
	Public Consistory for the Portuguese <i>obedientia</i>	76
	Concessions by the Pope to the King of Portugal	77

CHAPTER II.

THE MEDICI AND THE POLICY OF LEO X., 1513-1515.

1513	Giuliano and Giulio de' Medici arrive in Rome	79
	The Medici supreme in Florence; Lorenzo made governor	80
	Giulio de' Medici made archbishop of Florence	81
	Leo's first creation of Cardinals	82
	Characters of Cibo, Pucci, and Bibbiena	83

A.D.		PAGE
1513	Reorganization of the department of Papal Secretaries	85
	Confidential position of Bibbiena	86
	Inordinate schemes for the exaltation of the Medici family	87
	These do not emanate from Leo	87
	Conditions of nepotism quite different from the time of Alexander VI.	88
	The personalities of Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici	89
	The Pope denies the rumour that the crown of Naples is destined for Giuliano	92
	The Emperor and Ferdinand of Spain distrust Leo	93
1514	Overtures of Louis XII. to Spain result in a truce for one year	93
	Care for the independence of the Holy See, and for the liberty of Italy, predominate in the policy of Leo	94
	Great activity of Papal diplomacy	95
	Fear of Spanish supremacy inclines the Pope towards France	96
	Lang endeavours to effect a reconciliation between the Emperor and Venice	96
	Refusal of Lang's demand for the German legation	97
	Canossa sent on a mission to France and England	98
	Exasperation of the Romans against the Spaniards	99
	Secret negotiations with Venice and France	99
	Canossa, supported by Wolsey, effects an alliance between England and France	100
	The dangerous clause in the Treaty of London	100
	Shifting relations between the Pope and France	101
	Secret contract signed by Leo X. and Louis XII.	102
	The Pope, though averse to an attack on Milan by Louis, does not oppose it openly	102
	Louis suspects an alliance between the Pope and the Emperor	103
	Secret agreement between Leo and Ferdinand	103
	The French enlarge upon the advantages to the Church, Italy, and the Medici from a treaty between Leo and France	104
	Anxiety of the Pope, who puts off a final decision	105
	Death of Louis XII. and accession of Francis I.	106
1515	Marriage of Giuliano de' Medici with Filiberta of Savoy	106
	Attempted coalition to prevent a French conquest of Milan	107
	Leo delays ratification of the terms of the League and follows a waiting policy	108

A.D.		PAGE
1515	Negotiations of Canossa in France	108
	Francis disinclined to consider the demands of the Pope, who begins military preparations	109
	Leo sends money for payment of the Spanish and Swiss soldiers	110
	Papal adhesion to the League signed, but not published	110
	The Pope only acts after the French strike the first blow	111
	Giuliano de' Medici commands the Papal troops, and falling ill, is succeeded by Lorenzo	111
	The price of Giuliano's joining France	112
	Care for the independence of the Holy See turns the balance in the position taken up by the Pope . .	113

CHAPTER III.

THE CONQUEST OF MILAN BY THE FRENCH.—THE MEETING
BETWEEN LEO X. AND FRANCIS I. AT BOLOGNA.

1515	Francis concentrates his army at Lyons, and renews the alliance with Venice	114
	Crosses the Alps, surprises and takes prisoner Colonna	115
	The Pope loses courage. Loss of Alessandria	116
	Giulio de' Medici to reinstate the Bentivogli in Bologna	116
	Irresolution of the Legate, and indecision of the Pope	117
	Vacillation of the Pope	118
	Wolsey raised to the purple	119
	Schinner stirs up the Swiss to fight	119
	Francis I. in Lombardy; his position at Marignano attacked by the Swiss	119
	Victory of the French; reception of the news by Leo	120
	The Swiss abandon Lombardy	122
	The Pope's idea of resistance vanishes. Francis disinclined to a war with Leo X.	123
	Leo makes up his mind to a change in his policy, but finds it difficult	124
	The Pope insists on certain conditions in favour of Florence	125
	And sends urgent letters to the French King	125
	On October 11th the French enter Milan	126
	And on the 13th Leo approves the preliminary articles of peace	126

A.D.	PAGE
1515	Francis guarantees the authority of the Medici in Florence 127
	And is desirous of a personal interview with the Pope 127
	Bologna decided on as the place for the meeting 128
	The Cardinals in Consistory consent to the expedition to Bologna 129
	The Pope to travel <i>via</i> Cortona and Florence 130
	Great preparations made in Florence for his reception 130
	Magnificence of the spectacle 131
	The present for the French King 132
	Illness of Giuliano de' Medici 133
	Arrival at Bologna on December 7th 133
	Coolness of the Pope's reception by the inhabitants 133
	Francis arrives on December 11th and visits the Pope 135
	Interviews of Leo X. with Francis 137
	Who is lavish in his attentions to the Pope 138
	Bonnivet's brother created Cardinal 139
	The meeting terminates on December 15th 140
1516	The Pope arrives in Rome on 28th of February 140
	Results of the interview 141
	Leo still desires to remain true to the league with Germany 143
	The objects of Francis only partially attained 144
	Francis obtains the right to levy a tax on the French clergy 145
	The Concordat, and Pragmatic sanction 145
	Thus the Pope succeeds in dispersing the storm 146

CHAPTER IV.

THE WAR OF URBINO.—THE CONSPIRACY OF CARDINAL PETRUCCI.—
THE GREAT CREATION OF CARDINALS, JULY 1, 1517.

1515	Francesco Maria of Urbino disregards his oath of fealty 147
	Does all in his power to stir up the French King against the Pope 147
	At Bologna, Francis in vain intercedes for him 148
	His deposition becomes a foregone conclusion 148
1516	Alfonsina persuades the Pope to grant the duchy to her son Lorenzo de' Medici 148
	Francesco Maria summoned to Rome 149
	The accusations raised against him 149
	Disobeys the summons, but sends Elisabetta Gonzaga to intercede for him 150

A.D.	PAGE
1516	On March 14th deprived by a Papal Bull of his possessions 150
	Death of Giuliano de' Medici at Fiesole 150
	In him Francesco Maria loses his most powerful intercessor 151
	But hopes the French King will take up his cause 151
	Maximilian crosses the Alps, and Francis requests assistance from the Pope 152
	The Emperor threatens the Legate with a sweeping reform of the Curia 153
	Leo's ambiguous course of action 153
	Francis I. in a frame of mind hostile to the Papacy 154
	And the Pope less friendly towards France 155
	This decides Francis to abandon the Duke of Urbino 155
	The entire duchy succumbs to Lorenzo de' Medici 155
	Who is invested with the title 157
	Francis endeavours to regain the friendship of the Medici 158
	Leo detests French dominion in Italy 158
	Francis I. and Charles V. conclude the treaty of Noyon about Naples 159
	A Treaty between the Emperor and Henry VIII. sent to the Pope for approbation 160
	League of Cambrai between the Emperor and the Kings of France and Spain 161
	The Pope permits Francis to raise a Crusade-tithe 162
	Francis announces to the Pope the conclusion of the treaty of Noyon 162
	And professes his zeal for the Crusade 163
	Friction between the Pope and Francis 163
	Leo exhorts the Swiss to peace, and sends an extraordinary mission to France 164
1517	Rising in Urbino. The Pope taken by surprise 165
	And believes that France and Venice had a hand in it 166
	The Pope in a state of dangerous isolation 167
	Lorenzo de' Medici leaves Rome to take command of the Papal troops 167
	Francesco Maria reoccupies Urbino 168
	The Pope's anxiety increased by the Turks, and by the treaty of Cambrai 169
	Discovery of Petrucci's plot against the Pope's life 170
	Causes of Petrucci's discontent 171
	He bribes the doctor, Battista da Vercelli, to poison the Pope 171
	Quits Rome, and with his brother conspires openly 172
	Petrucci's confidant, Nino, arrested and tortured 173

A.D.	PAGE
1517	Cardinals Petrucci and Sauli arrested and imprisoned 174
	Excitement caused in Rome by this measure 175
	Protest by the Spanish representative 175
	Other suspected persons arrested 176
	The Consistory of May 29th 177
	Arrest of Cardinal Riario 178
	Who is imprisoned in St. Angelo and makes a full confession 178
	At the Consistory of June 8th, Leo complains of the ingratitude of those whom he had loaded with benefits 179
	And Castellesi and Soderini confess their complicity, and implore mercy 179
	They are pardoned, fined, and flee from Rome 180
	Lorenzo de' Medici urges severe punishment 181
	Result of the trial announced at the Consistory of June 18th 181
	The judgment passed on Petrucci, Sauli, and Riario 182
	Minutes of the trial read to the Ambassadors then in Rome 183
	Execution of Battista da Vercelli and Nino 184
	The sentence of death against Petrucci carried out at once 185
	Opinion of Giovio about these criminal schemes 187
	Black ingratitude of Sauli, on whose behalf, however, many appeals are made 188
	As well as for Riario 188
	Strict conditions of Riario's pardon 189
	Who makes a full public confession to the Pope 191
	Motives that induced the Pope to pardon Riario 192
	Who retires to Naples in 1520 and dies July 7th, 1521 193
	Sauli pardoned, but lives a retired life 194
	Soderini confined to the Kingdom of Naples until the death of Leo 195
	Castellesi refuses the summons to Rome 195
	And remains in Venice until the death of the Pope 196
	Leo contemplates a complete renewal of the Sacred College 197
	Hostile opinion in Germany and elsewhere as to the punishment of the criminals 197
	Leo profits by past occurrences to create a large number of Cardinals 199
	Thirty-one Cardinals nominated on July 1st 200
	Ten new cardinalitial titles created 201
	Characters of the new Cardinals, and reasons of their nomination 201

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xlix

A.D.		PAGE
1517	Many of them excellent and worthy men	207
	Papal authority over that of the Cardinals fully confirmed	207
	To the Pope alone belonged the right to summon, prorogue, or dismiss a Council	208
	The war in Urbino continues	208
	Its enormous expenses	209
	The French King secretly supports Francesco Maria	210
	Mediation of Spain and France	210
	The war comes to an end	210
	Full amnesty granted to Francesco Maria, who retires to Mantua	211
	Appalling sum of Leo's war expenses	211
	Disastrous effects on the States of the Church	212

CHAPTER V.

THE POPE'S ENDEAVOURS TO PROMOTE A CRUSADE,
1517-1518.

1513	Leo honestly bent on promoting a Crusade	213
	Sends a Legate to preach the Crusade in Hungary	214
	But with no success	215
1515	The Pope appeals to all Christian Princes	215
	A fleet fitted at Ancona. Venice shows no desire to support the Pope	215
1516	Danger to Hungary, whose king, Ladislas, dies in March	216
	The Pope sends Orsini to Hungary	216
	And money to the Ban of Croatia	217
	Leo often turned aside by other interests	217
	In October endeavours again to stir up the zeal of Christian princes	218
	High-sounding assurances of Francis I.	218
1517	Mission of von Schönberg to the Emperor	219
	Bad news from the East. Various plans made	219
	In the last session of the Lateran Council, the Crusade solemnly proclaimed	220
	The Urbino affair interferes with it	220
	When peace is restored, the Pope takes it up with decision	221
	Wisdom of Leo in turning first of all to Venice	221
	He sends Averoldo as Legate to the Signoria	222
	Appoints a Congregation of Cardinals; and three Cardinals to preach the Crusade	222

A.D.	PAGE
1517	The six principal questions presented in the memorandum issued by the Conference 223
	Estimated amount of war expenses 224
	Suggestions as to the raising of men and money 225
	The memorandum communicated by the Pope to the Sovereigns 226
	This appeal, an expression of the solidarity of all Christian States against the infidel 227
	Leo's great expectations from the King of France 227
	Francis puts off giving an answer 228
	The objections he raises 229
	Maximilian's jealousy of the French King 229
	His suggestions about the undertaking 230
	Opinions of King Charles of Spain 230
	Want of good will on the part of Venice 230
1518	The Pope determines to send Legates <i>de latere</i> to the principal European countries 331
	And urges a five years' truce between Christian princes 232
	Intercessory processions and preaching of the Crusade take place in Rome 233
	Sermon by Sadolet 233
	The Pope's endeavours find expression in art 234
	His efforts shattered by the self-interest of the European powers 235
	His greatest disappointment comes from Venice 235
	Who displays the most short-sighted egoism 236
	And shamelessly betrays the Christian cause 236
	The Legates set out on their errand 237
	Canisio preaches the Crusade in Spain 238
	But Henry VIII. and Wolsey refuse to receive either the Bull or Campeggio 239
	Who is detained at Boulogne in inactivity 240
	Bibbiena in France; his difficulties 240
	Lorenzo de' Medici, since his marriage, becomes French in his sympathies, and remains in France 241
	The Anglo-French alliance 241
	Wolsey's triumph. Campeggio allowed to land on July 29th 242
	The Pope greatly displeased with Wolsey's proceedings 243
	But ratifies the London agreement 243
	Cajetan in Germany; obstacles from Lang 244
	Maximilian presented with the blessed Hat and Sword 244
	Cajetan's discourse to Maximilian 245
	Who makes proposals to the States adverse to the Legate 246

A.D.	PAGE
1518	Hostile feeling in Germany. Malicious pamphlets . . . 247
	Cajetan's efforts fail before the anti-curial feeling . . . 248
	Decision of the States on the Crusade tax . . . 249
	Answer from Rome to the German complaints . . . 250
	Charles of Spain more sincere in his offers than Francis . . . 251
	But the Spanish clergy oppose the tax . . . 252
	The matter of the Crusade falls quite into the background . . . 253

CHAPTER VI.

LEO X. AND THE IMPERIAL SUCCESSION.

1518	Attitude of Leo on the question of the Imperial succession . . . 255
	His first object the independence of the Holy See . . . 256
	Exaltation of his relatives comes only second . . . 256
	Motives for his dislike of Charles' election . . . 257
	Turns his eyes to the Elector of Saxony as a possible candidate . . . 258
	Is sincere in wishing for neither Charles nor Francis . . . 259

(PART I.)

1518	Maximilian's plan to secure Charles' election . . . 259
	Bibbiena to obtain information as to the position of the French King . . . 260
	Question of the investiture of Naples . . . 260
	Leo does not wish to cut himself off from a possible arrangement with Charles . . . 261
	Idea of the Saxon candidature . . . 262
	The Pope keeps up communication with Francis . . . 262
	Cardinal Medici formulates the complaints against Francis . . . 263
	These make an impression upon the King . . . 264
	The question of Maximilian's coronation . . . 264
	Leo's attitude to the envoy of Maximilian, Ciolek . . . 265
	The French king now declares himself ready to accede to Lorenzo's wishes, and also to renounce his candidature . . . 266-267
	He makes generous offers about the Crusade . . . 267
	The Pope keeps back the Bull of dispensation in respect to Naples . . . 268

A.D.		PAGE
1518	Some of Maximilian's desires granted	268
	But not that of the coronation	269
1519	Misuse of the Crusade money	269
	Leo concludes an alliance with Francis	270
	And also with his rivals!	270
	The manner in which the Pope avoids a decision	271
	The excuse for this ambiguous policy	271
	Death of Maximilian on January 12th	272

(PART II.)

1519	The death of Maximilian puts an end to Leo's indecision	272
	Instructions to Cajetan to oppose the election of Charles	273
	And to favour the candidature of one of the Electors	274
	The Diet of Augsburg favourable to Charles	274
	On January 29th Leo strongly inclines to Francis	275
	But did he really wish for the French candidate?	276
	The overwhelming extent of Charles' power	277
	Difficulty of the Pope's position between the two great powers	278
	Less danger from the French in Milan than from the Spaniards at Naples	278
	Leo's open partisanship with Francis	279
	Refuses request of the Swiss to leave the imperial dignity to the Germans	280
	Commits himself by the Brief to Cardinal Cajetan	280
	The electors protest against the Pope's action	281
	Death of Lorenzo, and birth of his daughter Catherine de' Medici	281
	Grief of the Pope. Urbino united to the States of the Church	282-3
	Lorenzo's death removes an obstacle to a change in the Papal policy	283
	Leo convinced of the futility of holding out in favour of Francis	284
	Charles endeavours to win the Pope's favour	284
	Leo's condition about the union of the Imperial crown with that of Naples	285
	Francis withdraws from the contest	286
	Charles unanimously elected on June 28th	286
	Rejoicings of the Spaniards in Rome	288
	Charles announces his election to the Pope, and professes his good-will and submission	289
	The Pope sends his good wishes to Charles	290

CHAPTER VII.

THE OCCASION AND CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION IN
GERMANY.—THE CONTEST ABOUT INDULGENCES.

(PART I.)

A.D.		PAGE
1519	From the promulgation of an unimportant Indulgence a storm springs up	291
	Want of agreement in the opinions formed of Luther	291
	Glaring contrasts among the clergy at the close of the Middle Ages	292
	The enormous riches of the Church in Germany	293
	The misuse of such incomes	293
	Monopoly of cathedral benefices by the nobility	294
	The book <i>Onus Ecclesiæ</i>	294
	Episcopal sees monopolized by the princes	297
	Poverty of the lower clergy	298
	Multitude of religious foundations for masses, a testimony to the piety of the Middle Ages	298
	Absence of true vocations; immorality of the clergy	299
	Many good Bishops fought continually against these scandals	300
	The love of money in all grades of the clergy	301
	Plurality of benefices; facility with which the Popes granted dispensations for this	301
	Benefice-hunters flock into Italy	301
	Number of uneducated clergy	302
	Condition and number of religious houses	303
	Four great sources of their reform	303
	Varying results of the monastic reform	304
	Rich abbeys "hospitals for nobles"	305
	Bad repute of houses of religious women	305
	Quarrels between clergy and laity	306
	Expressed in revolutionary writings of the 15th century	306
	The greatest danger to the Papacy lay in the dis- content of the clergy	307
	The distinction between the currents of opposition to Rome in Germany	307
	Langenstein's work, the "Council of Peace," and that by Döring, "Confutatio Primatus Papæ"	308
	The anti-Papal movement in Germany under the Pontificates of Callixtus III. and Pius II.	309
	Bad effect of the secularization of the Roman Curia	310
	Bitter hatred of Italians by the Germans	311
	But this antipathy had no dogmatic tendency	311

A.D.		PAGE
1519	Decay of the Empire	311
	The long reign of Frederick III. especially injurious	312
	Taxation promoted by the Roman Jurists	313
	The Princes aspire to dominion in the spiritual domain	313
	Erasmus and the humanism of Germany	315
1512	The protest of Johannes Cochläus	316
	Wild extravagances of the younger humanists	317
	The morally-depraved Ulrich von Hutten	318
	Dispute between Reuchlin and the theologians of Cologne	319
1509	The affair of the scandalous books of the Jews	320
1511	Quarrel between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn	320
1513	Examination and verdicts on Reuchlin's "Augen- spiegel"	321
1514	Adrian of Utrecht and others appeal to the Pope to act promptly	322
	The Archduke Charles and Francis I. also warn the Pope, and beg him to decide	323
1515-17	The "Epistolæ obscurorum virorum" appear	324
1520	At last Leo X. condemns Reuchlin's book	325
	But this decision is too late	325

(PART II.)

1520	The abundance of inflammable material	325
	Discontent with the Curia's system of taxation	326
	Complaints of new indulgences being published with- out the consent of the Bishops	327
	The Crusade-tithe a grievance	327
	No account taken at the Papal Court of this dis- satisfaction	328
	No heed paid to Aleander's warning	328
1513	Leo X. revokes all the indulgences granted by Julius II. except that for the new St. Peter's	329
1514	Extension of this St Peter's Indulgence	329
	Accumulation of bishoprics by Albert of Brandenburg He obtains confirmation for this by a large money payment	330
	And is entrusted with the proclamation of the Indul- gence over a large district	331
	The term of simony applied to this case not quite borne out by facts	332
	It was the last stone which set the avalanche in motion	333
	The doctrine of Indulgences	334
	Their different kinds and application	335

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

lv

A.D.		PAGE
1514	Conditions required for gaining them	336
	The preaching of Indulgences	336
	Good results from this	337
	The evil crept in from the money-offering for good works	338
	This abuse dates to a great extent from the time of the Schism	338
	Abuses connected with the Jubilee Indulgence in the year 1390	339
	Crusading difficulties and other embarrassments lead to an increase of the abuse	340
	Complaints of men like Johann Eck who were devoted to the Holy See	341
1516	Cardinal Ximenes and others disapprove of the St. Peter's Indulgence	342
	Opinions of Canisio and Sadolet	343
	Unfortunately Leo, always in want of money, pays no attention	343
1515	Albert of Brandenburg entrusted with proclaiming the Indulgence of Mayence and Magdeburg	344
	The amount of money this realized is a manifest fable	345
	Tetzel made the Archbishop's sub-commissary	346
	Martin Luther begins to busy himself about the Indulgence	347
	Tetzel's sermons absurdly distorted	347
	He always taught the true doctrine	348
	The mere granting of a "confessional" letter does not gain an indulgence	349
	Extravagances in connection with indulgences for the dead condemned by Roman theologians	349
	Many preachers are imprudent	350
1517	On 31st October Luther affixes his ninety-five Theses on the church door at Wittenberg	351
	The primary object of this attack	351
	At that time Luther has no thought of separating himself from the Church	352
	The Archbishop of Mayence sends Luther's Theses to the Pope, with the opinion of his counsellors	353
	The Mayence Professors refuse to pass a judgment, but recommend an appeal to the Pope	354
1518	The Anti-theses of Tetzel, burned by the Wittenberg students	355
	Luther's sermon on Indulgences	355
	Tetzel publishes his "Vorlegung" against the sermon	356
	And a further set of fifty Theses on the authority of the Church	357

A.D.		PAGE
1518	Luther replies to these. Tetzel wrote no more . . .	358
	Luther's Theses scattered broadcast throughout Germany produce great effect	359
	They gain him a large following	359
	Most of whom thought Luther would carry on the reformation in obedience to the Church's laws . . .	360
	A few only saw the real danger	360

CHAPTER VIII.

LUTHER IS SUMMONED TO ROME. — HIS TRANSACTIONS WITH
CARDINAL CAJETAN AND WITH MILTITZ. — HIS ROMAN TRIAL. —
THE BULL "EXSURGE." — ALEANDER'S MISSION, AND THE
IMPERIAL EDICT AGAINST LUTHER.

(PART I.)

1518	Leo directs the Vicar-General of the Augustinians to remonstrate with Luther	361
	Who makes a determined resistance	362
	Refuses to retract. Preaches a sermon on the power of excommunication	362
	The canonical process instituted in Rome	363
	Prierias appointed theological examiner of the case . . .	363
	His "Dialogus," its form and object	364
	In July, Luther summoned to appear in Rome within sixty days	366
	In two days Luther writes a reply to the "Dialogus" . . .	366
	And appeals for defence to the Elector of Saxony . . .	367
	The Emperor's letter to the Pope	368
	Cajetan directed to call Luther before him	368
	In case of disobedience, to arrest Luther and send him to Rome, and declare his followers heretics . . .	369
	The Pope requests the Elector of Saxony to co- operate	370
	The Elector refuses to deliver up Luther	371
	Cajetan given the power of examining and deciding Luther's case	372
	Luther appears before the Legate, who receives him in a friendly manner	372
	His second interview with Cajetan	373
	Who declines to be drawn into an argument	374
	Luther writes an apparently respectful letter to Cajetan, but still refuses to retract	375

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

lvii

A.D.	PAGE
1518 Appeals from a Pope badly informed to one better informed	376
Flies from Augsburg. His manifesto affixed to the door of the cathedral	376
Contents of Luther's manifesto	377
The Elector again refuses the Legate's request	378
Luther issues another appeal, and a printed report of his interviews with Cajetan	378
The Pope sends a Constitution on Indulgences to Cardinal Cajetan	379
Who has copies of it spread throughout Germany	380
1519 The character and mission of Miltitz	381
Who acts without authority	382
Luther's letter to the Pope, of March 3rd	383
The glaring falseness of its contents	383
Luther moving with more and more certainty on the road of open apostasy	384
The Imperial election causes the Luther affair to fall into the background	385
The anti-Papal agitation increases, and Rome does nothing!	386
Cardinal de' Medici and Eck urge the Pope not to delay any longer	386
1520 The Pope appoints a Commission to deal with the matter	387
And a second Commission of theologians	387
Luther, since his alliance with the humanists, declares his complete secession	388
Hutten's character and works	388
His influence upon Luther for evil	389
Luther publishes a work to the German nation	390
The violence of its language and proposals	391
Its far-reaching effects	392
Advocates religious war and persecution against the Church	393
Drafting of the Bull "Exsurge"	394
Submitted to the Sacred College at four consistories	395
The Elector of Saxony requested to compel Luther to recant	396
Long sittings of the consistories	397
The rumour that other princes besides the Elector of Saxony side with Luther	398
"The gravest of Luther's offences"	399
The Bull published. Its solemn prelude	400
And condemnation of Luther's person and writings	401

(PART II.)

A.D.		PAGE
1520	Publication of the Bull "Exsurge" in Germany, entrusted to Alexander and Eck	404
	The appointment of Eck considered unfortunate	406
	Six of Luther's followers named in the deed of publication	407
	Three of them request absolution	408
	Opposition to the Bull in many places	409
	Many of the Bishops make difficulties about its publication	410
	Supine behaviour of Cardinal Lang	412
	And of the Catholic dukes of Bavaria	412
	Luther takes a more violent line against the Pope	413
	And publishes another pamphlet	414
	Burns the Papal Bull, together with the books of Canon Law, etc.	415
1521	On January 3rd excommunication pronounced on Luther and his followers	415
	Pirkheimer and Spengler ask for absolution	416
	Hutten publishes a pamphlet against the Bull	416
	And openly incites the people to revolt	417

(PART III.)

1520	Purport of the instructions to Aleander	419
	The Pope admonishes the Nuncios to work in harmony	420
	The Papal Bull put into execution in the Netherlands	420
	The Electors of Mayence, Cologne, and Treves show readiness to obey the Pope	421
	Aleander deceived as to the real opinions of Frederick of Saxony	421
	Project of submitting the case to arbitration	422
	Schemes of Erasmus; his hostility to Aleander	423
	Fatal delusion of the Nuncio	423
	Aleander arrives at Worms on November the 30th	424
	And places all his hopes in the Emperor	425
	Upon whose mind Aleander's arguments produce an effect	426
1521	The Council of State issue a mandate against Luther	426
	Aleander describes all Germany to be in a state of religious sedition	427
	A Papal Brief requests the Emperor to secure the execution of the Pope's sentence	428

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

lix

A.D.		PAGE
1521	Opening of the Diet at Worms, and speech of Aleander	429
	Action of the Catholic duke, George of Saxony	430
	Draft of an edict proposed to the Diet	431
	Which is rejected, and a safe-conduct given to Luther	432
	Threatening letters from Hutten to the Emperor and the Nuncios	432
	Luther arrives at Worms on 16th of April, and boldly defends his writings	433
	Charles declares his readiness to lay down his life and crown for the maintenance of the Faith	434
	Cowardice of the Archbishop of Mayence	435
	Charles compels Luther to leave Worms on the 26th of April	435
	Aleander draws up an imperial edict, which Charles refuses to sign before it had been made known to the States	436
	The edict passes the Diet, and is signed by Charles on May the 12th	437
	Terms of the Edict of Worms	438
	Energy and zeal of Aleander	439
	His unceasing warnings to the Curia to redress abuses	441



LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
I. Stazio Gadio to the Marchioness of Mantua	446
II. Pope Leo X. to the citizens of Bologna	446
III. Cardinal Sigismondo Gonzaga to the Marquis of Mantua	447
IV. Alessandro Gabbioneta to the Marquis of Mantua	448
V. VI. Paris de " Grassis, about the first " creation of Cardinals by Leo X.	449
VII. Paris de Grassis, about the entry of Cardinal Lang into the Consistory of December 9th, 1513	450
VIII. Paris de Grassis, about the Imperial "Obedi- entia" on December 11th, 1513	451
IX. Paris de Grassis, about the arrival of Bonnivet at Viterbo on November 2nd, 1515	451
X. The Consistory at Viterbo on November 5th, 1515	452
XI. Leo X. threatens Francesco Maria della Rovere with excommunication	452
XII. Pope Leo X. to Roberto Latino Orsini	454
XIII. Agostino Gonzaga to the Marquis of Mantua	456
XIV. Pope Leo X. to the Cardinals about the Crusade	457
XV. " on the Crusade	458
XVI. " to King Francis I.	458
XVII. " to Prospero Colonna	459
XVIII. Alessandro Gabbioneta to Tolomeo Spagnolo	459
XIX. The Consistory of April 20th, 1517	459
XX. " of May 19th, 1517	460
XXI. Ercole de Corte to the Marquis of Mantua	460
XXII. The Consistory of May 29th, 1517	462
XXIII. " of June 5th, 1517	462
XXIV. " of June 8th, 1517	463

lxii LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
XXV. Paris de Grassis, on the Consistory of June 8th, 1517	463
XXVI. Beltrando Costabili to Duke Alfonso of Ferrara	464
XXVII. " " " " " "	465
XXVIII. The Consistory of June 26th, 1517	466
XXIX. Paris de Grassis, about the negotiations of June 26th, 1517, relating to the creation of Cardinals	466
XXX. Paris de Grassis, about the creation of Cardinals on July 1st, 1517	467
XXXI. " " " " " "	467
XXXII. The Consistory of July 1st, 1517	469
XXXIII. Pope Leo X. to Cardinal Egidio Canisio	469
XXXIV. The Consistory of July 10th, 1517	470
XXXV. " of July 24th, 1517	470
XXXVI. The pardon of Raffaello Riario	470
XXXVII. " " " " " "	470
XXXVIII. Pope Leo X. restores Raffaello Riario to his dignities	488
XXXIX. Paris de Grassis, about Cardinal Riario	490
XL. " about the intercessory proces- sions for the Crusade	492
XLI. Leo X. to the Grand Duke Vasili of Moscow	493
XLII. " to the Prince of Tartary	494
XXXIII. " to Cardinal Raffaello Riario	495
XLIV. Baldassare Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua	496

INTRODUCTION.

INTRODUCTION.

JULIUS II., the most powerful of the Popes of the Renaissance, had given the Holy See a firm and substantial basis by his re-establishment of the States of the Church. At the same time, by his generous patronage of art, he had given a prominence, hitherto unequalled, to the great position held by his predecessors in the field of culture. When he convened the Council of the Lateran, the patron of Bramante, Raphael, and Michael Angelo was on the verge of grappling with the greatest and most difficult task of the age—namely, the reformation of the Church—when death snatched him away.

The successor of the Rovere Pope was a member of the house of Medici, who represented, as it has been the lot of few to do, both the good and bad side of the Renaissance. True child of his people and of his age, Leo X. was a rare mixture of glorious and inglorious qualities. A thorough Medici and a typical Florentine, he was a clever, not over-scrupulous, and indefatigably active politician. At the same time he was an open-handed and appreciative admirer of learning, art, and music. Nevertheless he lacked the courage, greatness, and depth of his predecessor.

For over a century, a cry for the reform of both the Head and members of the Church had resounded from all parts of Europe. Some of the attempts to effect this reform were actuated by no pure motives, while others were made in an unlawful manner; but there is no doubt that many

excellent men, moved by the best intentions, did concern themselves, in a lawful manner, with the reformation of abuses in ecclesiastical life and in the government of the Church; though what was accomplished remained far behind both the expectations formed and the necessities of the time. Many pious, enlightened, and wise men, religious as well as laymen, rose up in response to the call, and tried to apply a remedy to the evils of the day. Many hands were laid to the difficult task, though no decisive results were obtained; for even the best-intentioned efforts made but slight impression on the general deterioration of ecclesiastical discipline. The task was made the more difficult by the bad example of those belonging to the Roman Curia, which worked against the reformers.

With the dawn of the new century the cry for reform sounded louder and louder from both sides of the Alps, taking the shape of treatises, letters, poems, satires, and predictions, the theme of which was the corruption of the clergy, and especially the worldliness of the Roman Curia. To many the ancient Church seemed to be as rotten as the Holy Roman-Teutonic Empire; and many foretold the downfall of both these buttresses of the mediæval system.* The signs of the times became more and more threatening. To observant spectators it seemed as if, with the advent to power of the Medici, a heavy storm must break over the Church.

That a man who was not equal to the serious duties of his high office, who, in fact, knew scarcely anything about them, should be raised to the Chair of St. Peter at a moment so fraught with danger, was a severe trial permitted by God to overtake Christendom. With unprecedented optimism Leo X. looked into the future without anxiety,

* Cf. ROHR: Die Prophetie im letzten Jahrhundert vor der Reformation, in the *Histor. Jahrb.*, XIX., 447 *seq.* [547 *seq.*].

and frivolously deluded himself as to the importance of the times. He never gave a thought to reform, on the grand scale which had become necessary. After the delusive results which followed the conclusion of the agreement with France, he gave himself over to a growing feeling of security in respect to the countries on the other side of the Alps

The Pope disregarded even the most serious warnings, such as those uttered by Aleander in respect to Germany in 1516.* He did not co-operate in the half-measures taken, nor in the superficial attempts made to carry out the salutary decrees of the Lateran Council. Therefore the Roman Curia, which had for a long time been held in contempt and made the object of the bitterest satires, remained as worldly as ever. While by many it was scorned for its love of money, equal condemnation fell on the unworthy, immoral conduct of the Roman courtiers, of high and low degree, which the Supreme Head of the Church was either unable or unwilling to check. Political transactions, especially those which concerned the maintenance of the States of the Church, with which the independence of the Holy See was so closely connected, absorbed Leo X. more and more. Consequently, though most unnaturally, the concerns of the Church fell into the background, and were usually made subordinate to politics.

The approach of great catastrophes is usually heralded by the dark foreshadowing of future events. At that calamitous time prophetic utterances increased, and notes of solemn warning sounded from all quarters. Shortly before the close of the Lateran Council, the noble Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, in the presence of the Pope and the ecclesiastical assembly, delivered a famous oration relating

* Aleander mentions this in his letter of Feb. 27, 1521. See BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 31, p. 74.

to the reformation of morals in the Church.* Nothing can reveal the necessity of reform in a more startling way than the wretched picture drawn so unflinchingly by this distinguished layman. We have heard a great deal about the making of laws, said he, in apology for his interference, but very little about their observance. Yet nothing could be more urgent. To prove this he described, by the aid of rhetorical antitheses, a picture, painted in the darkest colours, of the corruption which had made its way into the Church. He emphatically pointed out to the Pope that it was his strict duty to remove the crying abuses in ecclesiastical government. In conclusion, he added these words of warning: "If Leo leaves crime any longer unpunished, if he refuses to heal the wounds, it is to be feared that God Himself will no longer apply a slow remedy, but will cut off and destroy the diseased members with fire and sword."

In that very year this oracular prediction was fulfilled.

The most momentous event in modern history, the disruption of the Church in Western Christendom—anticipated and dreaded by many—took place. It was a judgment on all, but not least on the Head of the Church, who was absorbed in politics and worldly pleasures. A canon of Siena, Sigismondo Tizio, who was devoted to the Holy See, writes thus about the Pope: "Many were of opinion that it was bad for the Church that her Head should be absorbed in amusements, music, the chase, and buffoonery, instead of being occupied by the thought of the needs of his

* Ad Leonem X., P. M. et Concil. Lateran., I., Fr. Pici Mirandulæ domini de reformandis moribus oratio. Early in 1517 there were handed over to the Pope (see Pico's letter to Pirkheimer, Freytag, *Vir. doct. epist. ad Pirkheymerum*, Leipzig, 1831, 8; *cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 723, n. 1) various MSS. (*e.g.* Cod. X., VI., 22, n. 58 of the Casanatense Library, Rome), printed in 1520, at Hagenau, and frequently later, also by ROSCOE-BOSSI, VIII., 105 *seq.*

flock, and in bewailing its misfortunes. The salt of the earth has lost its savour, and nothing remains for it but to be cast out and trodden on by men.” *

The danger of the anti-Papal movement which had broken out in Germany did not escape Leo X., but, absorbed as he was in politics and immersed in the excitements of a worldly life and æsthetic enjoyment, he completely lost sight of his primary duty, and was essentially the wrong man to check the storm at its beginning. He neither realized the full importance of the situation, nor did he understand the deeper causes which had led to the secession from Rome. He was incapable of comprehending that nothing short of a radical reformation in the Head and members of the Church could arrest the movement which had been in preparation for so long. Thus, at this, the most severe crisis which had met her in her fifteen hundred years of history, the right ruler was wanting to the Church. Instead of the Medici Pope, the Church needed a Gregory VII.

Leo's successor, the noble Adrian VI., the last Pope of Teutonic race, grasped at once the one thing needful, which had been left undone by his predecessor. The pontificate of this distinguished man, though all too short, was rich in decrees for a thorough and trenchant disciplinary reform which covered nearly the whole area of ecclesiastical life. Unfortunately, however, the dry, sober-minded Dutch professor did not in the least understand the Italian temperament, so unlike his own: nor did the

* *Male igitur cum ecclesia esse actum multi arbitrabantur, cum ecclesiae caput cantilenis, musicis, venationibus et delusionibus vacet hominum dementium, cum sapere virum oporteret et suarum ovium calamitatibus miserescere et illacrymari. Sal igitur infirmatum est nec restat aliquid ulterius nisi ut foras mittatur et ab hominibus conculcetur.* TIZIO, * *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 37 f., 325.* Chigi Library, Rome.

Italians understand him. To the end he remained a foreigner on Roman soil. While in his immediate surroundings he called forth the strongest national antipathy, his trenchant reforms raised up many enemies. His death was, therefore, hailed by the Romans as a happy event.

Though, notwithstanding his good intentions, his clear powers of perception, and honest endeavours, Adrian VI. did not succeed during his eighteen months' pontificate in remedying the evils which were the accumulation of a century and a half, still he has the merit of being the first Pope who had the courage to place his finger on the wound, and indicate what had to be done in the future.

Another Medici followed him. Seldom have high expectations been so cruelly disappointed as they were in Clement VII. In spite of his many good qualities, his temperance, his abstemiousness and piety, and his patronage of literature and art, his pontificate was one of the most disastrous known to history. The chief cause of this is to be found in the inconceivable irresolution and pusillanimity of the Pontiff, who lost courage at once, and let the helm fall from his grasp. It needed the royal spirit, the bold determination, the mighty strength of a Julius II. to look consequences in the face, take the lead in Italy's fight for freedom, and wrest the Papacy from the dominion of Spain. It was obvious therefore that a small-minded, pusillanimous calculator, such as Clement VII., must fail. "This man," says Guicciardini, "was raised to the Papal See by a wondrous stroke of fortune. But when he reached the summit, the misfortunes which attended him greatly outweighed his good fortune. For what prosperity can be put in the balance against the ignominy of his captivity, the misery of the sack of Rome, or the evil fate of bringing about the ruin of his native city?" *

* GUICCIARDINI, XX., 2.

The Florentine historian does not mention what was the greatest misfortune of all. While Clement VII. was so unhappy in his attempts to procure the freedom of Italy and the Holy See, as to end by sealing their dependence on Spain, the defection from Rome in the north assumed terrific proportions. When Clement died, nearly one-third of Europe had broken from the time-hallowed unity of the Catholic faith, which till then, in spite of political and national disturbances, had held all Christian people together.

The religious unity of the Western Church was rent; the great, the blessed, the civilizing influence of Rome was destroyed in a considerable portion of Europe; the common defence against the arch-enemy of Christianity was broken, and Christian civilization was rent asunder.

Neither of the Medici Popes had fulfilled his duty as regarded the great secession from Rome; for that duty consisted above all things in the concentration of their energies on the work of ecclesiastical reform, with a total disregard for every consideration, whether worldly or national. Both these Popes were but too often unfaithful to their charge by subordinating their pastoral duty to politics, power, and love of possession. Both ignored what lay at the very root of the evil, and mistook throughout the only means to be taken for its removal.

In vain did the cry for help and salvation from ruin resound; and one after another the hopes of better things were shattered. Pain and sorrow filled the souls of the noblest, who sadly asked themselves why it was that Divine Providence permitted the Church to fall into such confusion. But together with this grief over the evilness of the times and the disorders with which a worldly spirit had saturated the Church, there was mingled an angry indignation with the chief pastors who responded so badly

to their great vocation. To many it seemed as if all were already lost.

Then help came. As in the days of Gregory VII., so now again salvation came from within the Church. She might be disfigured by hideous evils; she might be oppressed and trodden under foot by her enemies; but it was now proved that the divine spark of life within her was not extinct.

Nearly the whole of the north, and a great part of central Europe, had broken the bonds of reverence and authority which had for so long united them to the Holy See, and had taken up with a new religion. But in the south there were raised up men who, imbued with the Divine Spirit, holding fast to the treasure of the ancient faith, and obedient to the lawful authority of the Church, worked with ardent zeal and untiring energy for their own sanctification as well as for a general and fundamental renewal and reformation of the life of the Church. Egidio Canisio of Viterbo, when speaking before the Lateran Council, had simply and succinctly summed up the theory of true Catholic reformation. "Men must be changed by religion," said he, "and not religion by men."*

As in the 11th century the Cluniacs, in the 12th the Cistercians, and in the 13th the Franciscans and Dominicans had been raised up to be true reformers, and had stirred up and developed a devoted activity, so now did the noblest among men combine to work for the purification and renovation of the Church. Before the end of the pontificate of Leo X., the Oratory of Divine Love had been formed in Rome. This community grew under Clement VII., and the sack of Rome by the Imperial troops was the cause of its spread over a great part of Italy. The horrible catastrophe which overtook the

* HARDOUIN, IX., 1576.

capital of Christendom terminated the Renaissance. Contemporaries justly regarded it as a divine judgment, and for many it was the occasion of conversion and amendment of life. New Orders sprang into being under the two Medici Popes which corresponded to the needs of the time, and achieved most practical ends. Such were the Theatines, the Capuchins, the Clerks Regular of Somascha, the Barnabites, and, lastly, the most important instrument of all for the Catholic reformation and restoration, the Society of Jesus.

Saints, apostles and heroes sprang up, and by their mode of life introduced a new era for the regeneration of the Church, and solved the problem, already a century old, of ecclesiastical reform. Like most things that are really great, the reformation of the 16th Century grew out of small, hidden beginnings. It grew silently at the foot of the Curia, till at length it embraced those who bore the dignity of the Papacy. Having accomplished this, it made its way triumphantly in ever-widening circles, winning back a part of that which had been lost, and purifying and ennobling that which had remained faithful.

LEO X. 1513-1521.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

ELECTION AND BEGINNING OF THE PONTIFICATE OF LEO X.—HIS EFFORTS TO MAKE PEACE.—END OF THE SCHISM OF PISA.

A GREAT pontificate had come to an end. Those Cardinals who attended the Conclave as possible candidates for the Papacy, must have asked themselves whether there were any one among them who could worthily fill the place of one whose rule had been as imposing as that of Julius II. Yet the number of claimants for the supreme dignity was unusually large. Ten, or, according to other accounts, eleven or even twelve Cardinals were eager competitors for the vacancy.*

At the time of the death of Julius II., the Sacred College consisted of thirty-one members in all,† of whom twenty at the most were then present in Rome. Five of those absent arrived in time, so that twenty-five Cardinals took part in the Papal election. Of these, nineteen were Italians (Riario, Grimani, Soderini, Vigerio, Fieschi, Adriano Castellesi, Leonardo Grosso della Rovere, Carretto da Finale, Sisto Gara della Rovere, Cioocchi del Monte, Accolti, Achille de Grassis, Sauli, Medici, Luigi d'Aragona,

* Besides SANUTO, XVI., 16, 38, *cf.* the *letter of Cardinal Gonzaga of March 11, 1513 (see Appendix, No. 3), Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; and S. TIZIO, **Historiae Senensis* in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 229, Chigi Library, Rome.

† See the Register in SANUTO, XVI., 30, which is better than that in CIACONIUS, III., 309 *seq.* REUMONT (III., 2, 49) and others are wrong in putting the Cardinals at thirty-three in number.

Cornaro, Farnese, Sigismondo Gonzaga, and Petrucci). Two were Spaniards (Remolino and Serra). To these were added the Frenchman Robert Challand, the German-Swiss Schinner, the Hungarian Bakócz, and the Englishman Bainbridge. One Cardinal, Raffaello Riario, owed his elevation to Sixtus IV., and another, Giovanni de' Medici, owed his to Innocent VIII.; while of the remainder, ten had been raised to the purple by Alexander VI., and thirteen by Julius II.

Discussions as to the Papal election had begun during the lifetime of Julius II. It was the common opinion that Raffaello Riario, Bakócz, and Grimani, notable for their riches and influence, and after them Fieschi, had the best chance of attaining to the supreme dignity;* but this would be the case only if such unlawful means as bribery by money or by the gift of benefices were resorted to.† Fortunately, this had been put out of the question by the severe Bull which Julius II. had issued on the subject. No one, writes Cardinal Sigismondo Gonzaga,‡ dared to act contrary to this Bull. The Romans, who considered the election of Grimani or of Bakócz as a foregone conclusion, found themselves entirely mistaken. The Venetian Ambassador, who naturally was interested in the claims of his beloved fellow-countryman Grimani, declared emphatically that a simoniacal election was out of the question, and that therefore the wealthy Cardinals were not likely to attain their object. If, continues the Ambassador, an irreproachable life is to give the preference,

* SANUTO, XV., 554; *cf.* 572; XVI., 6. NITTI, 5, n. I. FRANKÓI, Ungarn und die Liga von Cambrai, 88 *seq.*, and Bakócz, 130 *seqq.*

† SANUTO, XVI., 16.

‡ *Letter of the 11th March, 1513 (Appendix, No. 3), Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

then, after Grimani, either Medici or Carretto da Finale must be taken into account.*

The election of Grimani, of which the Venetians entertained great hopes, was rendered impossible by the opposition with which his candidature was met by the Emperor Maximilian's representative, Count Carpi, as well as the Spanish Ambassador, Hieronymus de Vich. The favourite candidate of Spain was Raffaello Riario, while Maximilian steadfastly adhered to Adriano Castellesi.† But the Sacred College was not inclined to consult the wishes of either of these princes, though they were fully agreed with them on the one point, that the Cardinals deposed by Julius II. should not be allowed to take part in the Conclave.

Carvajal, the leader of the schismatic Cardinals, vainly applied to Maximilian to intercede with the Sacred College for him and his companions. Every prospect of their being admitted to the Papal election vanished in the face of the military precautions taken by the Spanish Government both by sea and land. Even the attempt made by France to stir up sedition in Rome through the Orsini, and thus obstruct the election, failed.‡

Apart from petty disturbances, the days of the vacancy of the Holy See, usually so stormy, passed by peacefully. A newsmonger of the time writes that never in the memory of man had a like quiet prevailed during any Conclave. This was partly owing to the effects of the strong rule of Julius II., and partly to the precautions taken by the Cardinals, and the promises they had made to

* SANUTO, XVI., 20; *cf.* 19.

† Report of Carpi in *Lettres de Louis XII.*, IV., 75; SANUTO, XVI., 24, 29, 30, 38; PETRUCELLI DELLA GATTINA, I., 484, 493; GEBHARDT, *Adrian von Corneto*, 27.

‡ ZURITA, X., 57, 58; SÄGMÜLLER, *Papstwahlen*, 137 *seq.*

VOL. VII.

the Romans.* Even the States of the Church remained for the most part at peace, though Giampaolo Baglioni succeeded once more in taking possession of Perugia.†

The Conclave was held on the second floor of the Palace of the Vatican, made for ever famous by Raphael's frescoes. The oath was administered to the custodians in the chapel of Nicholas V., and the business of the Conclave was carried on in the Sistine Chapel.‡ Here there were erected for all the Cardinals, even those who were absent, with the exception of course of the schismatics, thirty-one cells, so small and dark that one of the Ambassadors likened them to the cells of a prison or hospital.§ These rooms were apportioned by lot, with the exception of those allotted to the three sick Cardinals, Sisto Gara della Rovere, Soderini, and Medici, for whom better apartments were set aside. The cell of Soderini was near the Cantoria, while those of both the others were near the door leading into the sacristy. Sisto Gara della Rovere was so ill that he had to be carried into the Conclave; and Cardinal de' Medici, who had arrived with all haste from Florence, suffering from a fistula, had to use a sedan-chair. Each Cardinal had with him several conclavists, besides whom there were two Secretaries to the Conclave, who were admitted inside. The key of the Conclave, at which there were present seventy-five persons exclusive of the Cardinals, were kept by the two Masters of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis and Blasius de Martinellis.

* SANUTO, XVI., 14, 15, 29, 38. *Letter of Stazio Gadio, March 3, 1513 (see Appendix, No. 1), Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. About the tranquillity of the Colonna, see (PASSARINI) *Memorie di Silvestro Aldobrandini*, Roma, 1878, 219 *seq.*

† GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4.

‡ For what follows see Paris de Grassis in GATTICUS, 310 *seq.*

§ SANUTO, XVI., 30.

The Mass of the Holy Ghost, before the opening of the Conclave, was said by Cardinal Bakócz, on the morning of the 4th of March. It could not on this occasion be celebrated at the tomb of the Princes of the Apostles, owing to the rebuilding of St. Peter's, which was in progress. It was said instead in the chapel of St. Andrew. The usual opening discourse was delivered by Bishop Petrus Flores. In stringent language this Spaniard exhorted the Conclave to elect as Pope a man who would bring peace to Italy, protect Christendom against the Turks, carry on the reform of ecclesiastical matters, and be able generally to cope with the difficulties of the situation. The speaker laid especial stress on the Bull of Julius II., which had been directed against simony, as on a sacred law. This over, the Cardinals entered into Conclave. Adriano Castellesi arrived only on the evening of that day, bringing the number of electors up to twenty-five.*

The arbitrariness and powerful will of Julius II. were so fresh in the memory of all the Cardinals, that their first action was to draw up an election capitulation, which was sworn to by all the Cardinals on the 9th of March. This consisted of public and secret articles. The former concerned the war against the Turks, as well as the revenues to be applied to it, more especially the exemption from taxation of the Cardinals; the reformation of the Roman Curia both in its Head and members; the immediate carrying out of the measures introduced in respect of this

* Paris de Grassis in CREIGHTON, IV., 275. GATTICUS, 311. P. FLORES, *Oratio habita Romae in basilica princ. apost. ad s. collegium cardinalium de summo pontifice eligendo Iulii II. successore*. Roman contemporary and original edition. Panzer cites only one Strasburg copy. The late arrival of Adriano (SANUTO, XVI., 29) explains GUICCIARDINI'S statement (XI., 4) that twenty-four Cardinals went into Conclave.

by Julius II., as well as regulations regarding the residence of the Curia in Rome. It was emphatically laid down in these articles that at least two-thirds of the Sacred College must be agreed as to any proceedings taken against any of its members, as to the nomination of new Cardinals, and Legates *de latere*, as to the conferring of a variety of ecclesiastical offices, and finally, as to the government of the States of the Church, from which the laity were almost entirely excluded. To show the importance of the Council of the Lateran in the matter of the reformation of the Church, as well as in that of the war against the Turks, a special decree bound the future Pope to continue and close it. But it could be neither dissolved nor suspended before it had discharged these duties, without the consent of the majority of the Sacred College.

The secret articles of the capitulation related chiefly to the privileges of the Cardinals. Among other things it was laid down that any Cardinal who did not possess an income of 6000 ducats should receive a monthly allowance of 200 ducats, that no one should be appointed Legate against his will, and that all the benefices attached to St. Peter's and St. John Lateran should be conferred on Roman citizens only. Finally, the Pope elected should consent to the division among individual Cardinals of all offices, towns, castles, and jurisdiction belonging to the States of the Church.*

As has been truly remarked, there is a peculiar irony in

* Paris de Grassis has given the election capitulation in his *Diarium*; there is a not quite trustworthy copy in HOFER: *Zur Kritik der ersten Regierungsjahre Karls V., II.*, 63 *seq.* SANUTO, XVI., 84 *seqq.*, and TIZIO in his **Historiae Senensis* (Cod. G, II., 37, f. 230 *seq.*, Chigi Library, Rome) adduces the document which was printed soon after: *Ista sunt capitula || facta in conclavi, que debent || observari cum summo pontifice*: 1513 (4 sheets in folio), State Archives, Vienna, *Romana*. At the same time there appeared a German translation: *Diss sein die Capitel nach absterben bapst Julii durch die Cardinel in Conclavi besch-*

the fact that just at the time when complaints were being made against Papal absolutism, the new Head of the Church should have had his hands thus tied in the most important matters.* Even the Imperial Ambassador declared that the newly-elected Pontiff would be only half a Pope if he observed this capitulation, to do which, however, he added, no one could force him, seeing that he received unlimited power from God.† In fact, the laying down of conditions was so overdone that they could not be carried out. As they were uncanonical, the Cardinals were bound before long to consent to their abolition.‡

The Bull of Julius II. against simony having been read on the 10th of March, a scrutiny could be delayed no longer. It could be seen by its result that no issue had been staked, for the electors had sought to conceal their own real object for the sake of finding out that of their opponents. The Spaniard Serra, who stood in no high repute, received most (fourteen) votes; but no one thought seriously of the elevation to the Papal See of this fellow-countryman of Alexander VI. Next to Serra came Leonardo Grosso della Rovere with eight, Accolti and Bakócz each with seven, Fieschi and Finale each with six votes, while Grimani received only two, and Raffaello Riario none at all.§ Among those who received only one vote at this scrutiny was Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici. Yet, on the evening of the same day, his election as Pope was almost a certainty. Medici's

lassen und abgeredt, so mit künfftiger bebstlicher hailikeit sollen gehalten werden: 3 sheets in 4to, *s.l.*, 1513.

* HÖFLER, *loc. cit.*, 60.

† Lettres de Louis XII., IV., 79. See also GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4. Cf. Propyl. ad Acta S.S. Maii, I., 149*-150*, and SANUTO, XVI., 133, 153. For the right side of the question see Vol. I. of this work, 282 *seq.*

§ About this scrutiny see the ** Report of Paris de Grassis (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

supporters watched through the whole night to prevent a possible counter-movement. Early on the 11th of March the votes were taken again in due order, with the result that the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent was declared to have been elected Pope.

The event was contrary to the expectations of most of those concerned. As to the immediate circumstances, we possess the accounts of the Imperial, Venetian, and Florentine Ambassadors, as well as a letter of Cardinal Sigismondo Gonzaga, all of which agree in essentials.* We can gather from these that outside influences told but little on the result of the election, which was due rather to the division of the Sacred College into the old and the young Cardinals, and the astute measures by which the latter turned the scale. With great skill the supporters of Medici had kept his candidature secret until the right moment. This explains why, in the first scrutiny, Medici received only the one vote of Cardinal Schinner. The chief objection to his elevation to the Papacy lay in his extreme youth. But here he was helped by the circumstance that even while the Conclave was sitting, he had to go through an operation for the fistula from which he was suffering. This seemed to exclude all likelihood of his reaching an advanced age.†

But what commended Medici most to the electors was the brilliant name of his family, the prominent position

* Letter of the Imperial Ambassador Carpi in *Lettres de Louis XII.*, IV., 72 *seq.* The Venetian account in *SANUTO*, XVI., 19, 28, 38-40; the Florentine in *PETRUCELLI DELLA GATTINA*, I., 490 *seq.* The * Letter of Cardinal Gonzaga of 11th March, 1513, is the only account given by a member of the Conclave. This I found in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, see Appendix, No. 3. Cf. the short ** Narrative of Paris de Grassis (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

† Cf. *JOVIUS*, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. 3, and *PETRUCELLI DELLA GATTINA*, I., 488.

he had held under Julius II., and the part taken by him against France, to say nothing of his personal qualities, his love of peace, his generosity, and his blameless morals. All these attracted the younger Cardinals, who trusted to his gentleness, kindness, and indulgence.*

The political reasons which contributed to the election of Medici are drawn up by the historian Francesco Vettori. "It was hoped," he writes, "that one who held sway in Florence would be powerful enough to resist both Spain and France, the two great powers which contended for supremacy in Italy, and therefore in Europe."† The cause of the outvoting of the older Cardinals was to be found chiefly in their want of unity and decision, whereas the younger (Sauli, Cornaro, Luigid'Aragona, Petrucci, Gonzaga, Ciocchi) held firmly together. A great impression had been made on them by the reconciliation between Medici and Soderini, to which the latter had consented immediately before the opening of the Conclave. He preferred to further the promotion of the adversary of his family interests than see Raffaello Riario Pope.‡ Schinner, who, by the desire of the Imperial Ambassador, had to work against both the Venetian and French candidates, also opposed Riario for personal reasons.§ Castellesi and Luigi d'Aragona also objected to Riario.|| Nevertheless, during

* Cf. Carpi's account, *loc. cit.*, 73, and SANUTO, XVI., 28, 30.

† VETTORI, 297.

‡ *Ibid.*, 338. Cf. VERDI, XIV., N. I.

§ Carpi, in *Lettres de Louis XII.*, *loc. cit.* According to the Swiss Ambassador, P. Falk, Schinner contributed not a little to the election of Medici; see *Anz. für Schweiz. Geschichte*, 1892, 375. Cf. RICHARD, 45. The declaration of ANSHELM, IV., 352 *seq.*, modified in STETTLER, *Annal.*, I., 481, that Schinner wished to be Pope himself, has no foundation. Cf. LUZIO, *Isabella d'Este ne' primordi del Papato di Leone X.*, Milano, 1907, 18, 89.

|| Cf. TIZIO, * *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G.*, II., 37, f. 229 (Chigi Library,

the earlier days of the Conclave, Riario was a formidable rival to Medici, for some even of the younger Cardinals were inclined to favour the nephew of Sixtus IV. This aroused the jealousy of some of the older Cardinals, who now went over to the side of Medici, among them being Adriano Castellesi, who had been hitherto one of his most violent opponents. Finally, Riario gave up all hopes of his own election, and secured for his rival the votes of his own adherents.

One formidable opponent to Medici alone remained—the Primate of Hungary, Bakócz, whom Julius II. had summoned to Rome. The Council of Pisa, convened in the interests of France, threatened the ecclesiastical unity of the west, and it had seemed necessary to be assured of the obedience of Hungary. This rich, ambitious, and very capable Prince of the Church reckoned on the help of Venice on behalf of his own candidature, and had promised, in the event of his election, an energetic prosecution of the war against the Turks.* The only important thing that told against him was that he was not an Italian. Medici's private secretary and conclavist, the eloquent and gifted Bernardo Dovizi Bibbiena, worked for his master's election with extraordinary skill;† and at last the obstinacy of the older Cardinals, who had threatened to make a demonstration

Rome). About Cornaro's efforts in favour of Medici, see SANUTO, XXXII., 208.

* This is reported by TIZIO, *Hist. Senen.*, Cod. G., II., 37, f. 304 (Chigi Library, Rome).

† See SANUTO, XVI., 19; BEMBUS, *Hist. Venet.*, XII. (ed. 1557) 537. Cf. BANDINI, Bibbiena, 14 *seq.*, and *Atti dei Lincei*, Ser. 4, Cl. di scienze mor., X., 6. On the 20th of May Leo X. had paid flor. 2000 auri de cam. vig. mandati sub die XII. Martii conclavistis pro precio cam. et bonor. S.D.N. que erant in conclavi. * *Intr. et exit.*, 551. (Secret Archives of the Vatican.)

by leaving the Conclave, gave way under the stress of circumstances.

It was unanimously declared by all parties that the election of Medici had been effected without simony.* All attempts of the electors to communicate with the outside world had been energetically prevented; and after certain figures had been found cut on the silver dishes, the Cardinals were given nothing but earthenware for their use.†

As senior Cardinal-deacon, it was Medici's lot to read out the voting papers. The Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, remarks that he did this modestly and calmly. He took the name of Leo, and adopted as his motto the words of the first verse of the hundred and nineteenth Psalm: "In my trouble I cried to the Lord; and He heard me."‡

Cardinal Farnese announced the result of the election to the people outside, who received it with demonstrations of joy. The cry of "Palle! palle!" (the name for the balls on the arms of the Medici) resounded through the streets of the Eternal City. The Florentine merchants residing in Rome outdid each other in testifying their joy.§ The astonishment caused by the election of a man not yet thirty-eight years of age was so great that many would scarcely believe the result of the Conclave.|| If

* SANUTO, XVI., 28, 40; *Lettres de Louis XII.*, IV. 76; *Letter of Card. Gonzaga of the 11th of March, 1513 (see Appendix, No. 3), Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and Raph. Volaterr. in the Cod. Vatic. 5875, f. 296, Vatican Library.

† PETRUCELLI DELLA GATTINA, I., 491.

‡ See Paris de Grassis in GATTICUS, 315; *cf.* FABRONIUS, 269. Contemporaries differ as to the reason of his choosing the name of Leo; see ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 15-16.

§ Penni in CANCELLIERI, 68.

|| Paris de Grassis in GATTICUS, 316; Cellini and Parenti in NITTI, 4, n. 1; *Diary of Cornelius de Fine in the National Library, Paris.

some passed an unfavourable judgment on the election on account of the youth of the Pope, if others amused themselves with making satirical allusions to his weak eyes,* as a general rule the joy was unaffected, for Giovanni de' Medici was one of the most popular members of the Sacred College. "It was the best choice which could have been made," said the Swiss Envoy, Peter Falk; "for Giovanni de' Medici inclines to peace, and is as gentle and temperate as Julius II. was violent and harsh. For a century the Church has had no Pope to be compared with this one. Everyone congratulates himself on this election. Only the older Cardinals cannot conceal their disappointment at the elevation of a man so young as to seem to cut off all their hopes of ever attaining to the supreme dignity."†

Other towns, especially Siena, had greater misgivings than had Rome lest the young Pope should not be equal to his heavy burden. It was also thought that Leo X. might show too much favour to his relations and fellow-countrymen. Stress also was laid on his naturally complaisant and weak character. But on the other hand it was argued that a man of his spotless reputation must prove to be a good and peace-loving Pope, whose pontificate would be useful to the Church.‡

All the enemies of France in Rome rejoiced at the election; though many did not trust to the firmness of Leo X.§ In Florence, however, the satisfaction was quite

* *Multi caeci cardinales creavere caecum decimum Leonem.* Cf. FABRONIUS, 270.

† SANUTO, XVI., 39, 40; *Lettres de Louis XII*, IV., 80; Letter of Falk in *Anz. für schweiz. Geschichte*, 1892, 375-376; TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 239, of the Chigi Library, Rome.

‡ Cf. TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. in Cod. A., II., 37, f. 238b-239, Chigi Library, Rome. See also Raph. Volaterr. in Cod. Vat. 5875, f. 29, Vatican Library.

§ Cf. PRATO, 310-311.

unbounded, when the news of his election reached that city only ten hours after it had taken place. No expense was begrudged to celebrate the great event; for this was the first time that a son of the city on the Arno had attained to the supreme dignity. The friends of the Medici deluded themselves with the wildest hopes, while even their enemies had to keep quiet and wait for further developments. But even in Florence there were not wanting those who feared for the liberty of their native city, while others, like true merchants, calculated the advantages which the event might bring to themselves.*

Among the European princes no one hailed the result of the election with greater joy than Ferdinand the Catholic. Zurita reports that the King had declared that the birth of an heir, the conquest of Granada, and Medici's elevation to the Papacy were the three happiest events in his life.†

What is remarkable is that the election of Leo X. was favourably received even in France. Louis XII. remarked that he who had been raised to the supreme dignity was a good man, from whom therefore nothing but good was to be expected.‡ The Emperor Maximilian's Ambassador in Rome, Alberto Pio, Count of Carpi, reveals to us the expectations formed in diplomatic circles regarding the new Pope. After a description of the election, he writes as follows: "The Pope, so far as we are able as yet to form an opinion, will act as a gentle lamb rather than as a fierce lion, and will be a promoter of peace rather than of war. He will fulfil his duties conscientiously. Though it is true

* LANDUCCI, 336 *seq.*; SANUTO, XVI., 36; NARDI, 271; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 24. Cf. GUASTI, *Carte Stroz.*, I., 6, and *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, Series 5, XIV., 17; J. ROCCA, *B. Cerretanis Dialog*, Münster, 1907, 43 *seq.*; NERLI, VI., 124.

† ZURITA, X., 57. Cf. GUICCIARDINI, *Opere* VI., 191, 196.

‡ SANUTO, XVI., 134.

that he will not be the friend of the French, he will not be their bitter enemy, as was Julius II. Careful of his honour and good repute, he will patronize the learned, orators, poets and musicians; he will erect buildings, and will not neglect either his religious duties or his care for the States of the Church. With the exception of war against the infidels, he will not be drawn into any other, except under grave provocation, and when, as it were, forced to it. What he begins, that also will he complete; he will act circumspectly and indulgently. Truly," adds Carpi, "the mind of man is variable." *

Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici was the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent and Clarissa Orsini, being born on the 11th of December, 1475. He was destined by his father for the ecclesiastical state at an age so early as to preclude all possibility of his free consent. Having been given the tonsure when only seven years of age, he soon, thanks to the powerful influence of his family, received the gift of many rich benefices, abbeys and dignities; † and on the 9th of March, 1489, was made Cardinal! Innocent VIII. consented most unwillingly to the elevation to the purple of this thirteen-year-old boy, and decreed especially that for the next three years Giovanni should neither wear the outward insignia of his dignity nor have either vote or seat in the College of Cardinals.‡ The classical education of the child-prince was undertaken by the most able humanists and learned men of the time, Angelo Poliziano

* Lettres de Louis XII., IV., 79.

† ROSCOE-BOSSI, I., 29 *seqq.*, 42 *seqq.*; REUMONT, Lorenzo II., 2, 361 *seq.* In 1483 he received the Archbishopric of Aix; but as it soon transpired that this see was not vacant, he received instead the rich Abbey of Passignano. Cf. V. LIENTARD, Le Pape Léon X., archevêque d'Aix (8-20 Juin, 1483), 1872.

‡ Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 356 *seq.*

and Bernardo Bibbiena, as well as the holy Marsilio Ficino, who had made the hazardous attempt to combine the platonic cultus with Christianity.*

From 1489 till 1491 Giovanni de' Medici studied theology and canon law with Filippo Decio and Bartolomeo Sozzini at Pisa.† On the 9th of March, 1492, he was invested with the insignia of the Cardinalate in the Abbey of Fiesole, and on the 25th of the same month he went to Rome, where he was received on the following day by Innocent VIII.‡ It was not without anxiety that Lorenzo de' Medici allowed the young Cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Domnica, who had till then led a pure and steady life,§ to go to the capital of the world, "the meeting-place of all vices." This is shown by the beautiful letter, full of earnest exhortations and prudent rules of life, which he wrote at that time to his son.||

The death of his father in 1492 recalled the seventeen-year-old Cardinal to Florence, whence he returned to Rome in July to take part in the Conclave; after which, when, much against his wishes,¶ Alexander VI. was elected Pope, he returned once more to his native city. There he remained till the catastrophe of 1494, which compelled him to escape from Florence disguised as a Franciscan. He who had been the favourite of fortune, now came across the more serious side of life for the first time. To a time of enjoyment there now succeeded the anxieties of a fugitive

* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 153 *seq.*

† BANDINI, Bibbiena, 6; ROSCOE-BOSSI, I., 52 *seq.*, 58 *seq.*

‡ See Vol. V. of this work, 358.

§ Cf. the testimony of G. Cortesius in HERGENRÖTHER, Regest. Leonis X. I. See also FRANC. NOVELLUS, *Vita Leonis X., in the Cod. Barb., lat. 2273 (XXXII., 64), f. 36-4, Vatican Library.

|| See Vol. V. of this work, 358-361.

¶ Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 384.

life. Giovanni, like his brother Piero, did not give up all hope of his family's recovery of what it had lost, and by word and deed took part in all the efforts to restore the Medici to power. But after his hopes had been shattered three times, he travelled for some years in Germany, the Netherlands, and France.*

When Giovanni returned to Italy in May, 1500, the changes in the political situation made it advisable for him to settle in Rome. There he lived in the palace of Sant' Eustachio, now the Palazzo Madama, surrounded by antiquities, statues, pictures, and a select library, and devoted himself to the literary and artistic interests which were traditional in his family.†

The year 1503 brought with it both the Papal election and the sudden death of Piero de' Medici. Giovanni, who was now the head of the family, did not disguise from himself that nothing but a change in the political situation could restore to his family the dominion over Florence. As a consequence of his widespread patronage, his great generosity, and his poor knowledge of business, he often found himself in very difficult circumstances;‡ but in spite of all his difficulties he firmly believed in his lucky star. According to him it was fortune which raised men to distinction; and with this he consoled his family. Nothing could fail them, unless they themselves gave in. As for him, however empty his coffers, he continued his generosity to learned and literary men, musicians and artists. This generosity pleased the Romans quite as

* See PASTOR, *Die Reise des Luigi d'Aragona*, 7.

† Cf. ALBERTINUS, 27; MICHAELIS in *Jahrb. u. archäol. Instit.*, VIII., (1893), 119 *seqq.*; MÜNTZ in *Mém. de l'Académ. de France*, XXXV., 2; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, I, 145 *seq.*

‡ Raphael Volaterranus in the *Cod. Vat.*, 5875, f. 22-23, Vatican Library.

much as did the gentleness and affability of the Cardinal of S. Maria in Domnica, who became one of the favourite members of the Sacred College.

The light-heartedness of Cardinal de' Medici was remarkable; and it never forsook him, even under the most painful circumstances. It is true that the son of Lorenzo led a more worldly life than did many of the older Cardinals; yet he was distinguished above all for his dignity and the decorum of his deportment.*

After long, troubled years, towards the end of the pontificate of Julius II., fortune smiled once more on him who had been so sorely tried. On the 1st of October, 1511, he was appointed Legate to Bologna and the Romagna. Before this, Cardinal de' Medici had afforded a proof of his trust in his lucky star; for during the severe illness of Julius II. in August, 1511, Giovanni was one of those who put themselves forward as candidates for the triple crown.† Though the recovery of the Pope put an end to all hopes of an immediate elevation to the supreme dignity, the prospect of a restoration to power of his family dawned on Cardinal de' Medici. So long as the Florentine Republic favoured the Pisa schismatics, Julius would take part with the Medici. In fact, their fate depended on the success of the Spanish-Papal army, with which Cardinal de' Medici remained as Legate. The slowness with which he acted in that capacity did not at all come up to the expectations of

* ROSCOE-BOSSI, 39 *seqq.*, 42 *seqq.*; REUMONT, III., 1, 266. Card. de' Medici's income in 1500 was only 6000 ducats (see Vol. VI. of this work, 92), 1513, 10,000 (SANUTO, XVI., 28).

† See Vol. VI. of this work, 369, 372. Cf. also SANUTO, XII., 441, and the *Letter of Vianesio Albergati, Burgos, Sept. 3, 1511, to Card. Medici, which mentions him and Cardinal Riario as both "papabili" on the occasion of the illness of Julius. Carte Strozzi., III., 151. (State Archives, Florence.)

the fiery della Rovere, though he justified his delays sufficiently to retain his post.* Once more, however, was he to experience the fickleness of fortune. On the 11th of April, 1512, the Spanish-Papal army suffered a severe defeat at Ravenna, at which Cardinal de' Medici was taken prisoner and carried off to Milan. When he was there, Julius II. sent him powers to grant absolution from ecclesiastical censures to the numerous Frenchmen who besought that grace; and ere long the captive saw himself surrounded by suppliants. When, in their turn, the French suffered a reverse, it was arranged that Cardinal de' Medici should be taken to France. But here the proverbial good fortune of his family asserted itself, for, while crossing the Po, he succeeded in evading his captors and escaped to Bologna.†

It was not hard to make Julius II. understand that nothing but a change in the government of Florence could destroy the French influence in central Italy. When war was in consequence declared against Florence, Cardinal de' Medici, in the retinue of Cardona, trod once more the soil of his native country. He was witness of the plundering of Prato, where he vainly tried to moderate the brutality of the Spaniards.‡ After a bloodless revolution had restored the dominion of his family in Florence, the Cardinal went to live there on the 14th of September, 1512. But although both he and his brother Giuliano did all they could to

* Cf. the *Letter of Cardinal Medici to Bibbiena from Faenza, Oct. 5, 1511 (justifying himself to the Pope on account of the necessity of more troops), and to Julius II. from Faenza, Oct. 24 (about the impossibility of obeying the order to march against Bologna, as was explained by Marc Antonio Colonna), Carte Stroz., VI.; also from the same source the draft of a *Letter of Nov. 1 to Julius II., explaining the reasons of his delay. (State Archives, Florence.)

† See Vol. VI. of this work, 405, 415 *seq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, 420.

find favour, the city remained in a state of disturbance.* A plot for the overthrow of the Medici had just been brought to light when the news of the death of Julius II. called the Cardinal with all speed to Rome, to take part in the Conclave from which he came forth Pope.

At the early age of thirty-eight he had, with almost unprecedented celerity, risen to the supreme dignity. What a fate had his been! Banished, imprisoned, liberated, at one time Lord of Florence, and now Supreme Head of the Church! What wonder that men of letters could not tire of extolling this favourite and conqueror of fortune in verse and inscription.†

As Leo was only deacon, he was ordained priest on the 15th of March and consecrated Bishop on the 17th.‡ As Holy Week was so near at hand, his coronation had to take place at once, and was fixed for Saturday the 19th, the Feast of St. Joseph, although, according to custom, the ceremony had to take place on a Sunday. In spite of the short time allowed for preparations, the function was carried out with great splendour. Cardinal Farnese placed on the head of the new Pontiff a tiara made specially for the occasion, set with rich pearls and precious stones. According to an ancient custom, the Pope was wont to confer many and generous favours, especially on the Cardinals. The demands this time were so many and exorbitant, that Leo, smiling, said to the Cardinals that they had better at once take

* REUMONT, III., 2, 55 *seq.*; ROSCOE-BOSSI, III., 174 *seqq.* On the 17th of Oct. Venice raised Card. Medici as well as Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici and their heirs to be Venetian patricians (Carte Strozzi., 339 *seq.*, 152, State Archives, Florence).

† The number 11 played a peculiar part in Leo's life. See a poem on this subject in MORONI, XXXVIII., 36.

‡ Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 15.

VOL. VII.

his crown, for then, being popes, they could grant to themselves all that they wished.*

On the following day, at the celebration of Palm Sunday, Leo X. rejected the use of the *Sedia Gestatoria*, remarking that, as he was so young, he did not need any assistance of the kind.† At the washing of the feet on Maundy Thursday, the Pope really kissed the feet of the poor men. The ceremony, said he, ought to take place in reality and not only in appearance.‡ It was the same with all the other striking solemnities of Holy Week. Leo X. took part in them with great recollection, and a close observance of the ritual. The demolition of St. Peter's, then in progress, made it impossible to celebrate the high mass on Easter Sunday in that basilica. The Sistine Chapel was therefore selected in its stead, with no detriment to the solemnity. On the

* Paris de Grassis in *Notices des MSS. du Roi* II., 574; *Letters of Frate Anselmo, dated from Rome, 1513, March 19 (Gonzaga Archives); SANUTO, XVI., 73; Penni in CANCELLIERE, 68; GORI, Arch., IV., 214. The letters in which Leo X. announced his election to the spiritual and temporal authorities are dated on the day of his coronation, *e.g.* that to the Bishop of Mantua (orig. in the Episcopal Archives at Mantua), to Perugia (copy in the Com. Libr. at Perugia), others in HERGENRÖTHER'S Regest. Leonis X., 1901-1902. Hergenröther enumerates only thirteen letters written before the coronation, beginning March 13. The first, written on the day of the election, is missing in Hergenröther. For this see Appendix, No. 2, from the State Archives, Bologna.

† *S. D. N. Leo sive quia in gestatorio vehi nesciat aut non velit, ut dixit, cum sit juvenis et ad labores aptus, praesertim ad gradiendum suis pedibus non voluit in gestatorio portari, dicens pedibus semper ambulare velle, nisi quando aut suae personae aut rei divinae necessitas cogat, et sic pedibus venit usque ad capellam. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Rossiana Library, Vienna, and Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

‡ Paris de Grassis in ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 62. Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 19.

contrary, as remarks the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, the Papal majesty could be displayed to better effect in the smaller space.*

On the 1st of April, the Romans were made happy by the removal of the tax on wine and flour.† On the 4th, the first Consistory was held, at which Paris de Grassis was made Bishop of Pesaro. At this ceremony the Pope appeared in a plain mitre without jewels.‡ But, on the other hand, no kind of splendour was omitted in the ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran, for which great preparations were made. It was fixed for the 11th of April, the Feast of St. Leo, as well as the anniversary of the capture of Leo X. at Ravenna. This was done so that that unlucky day might be changed into a day of rejoicing.§

The most extensive preparations for the decoration of the streets were made.|| All that the Rome of Raphael could produce in the way of antiquities and art was made to contribute to the glory of the Medici. The important occasion of the "Possesso," or taking possession of the Church of the Popes, was intended to usher in not only a new era of artistic magnificence, but also that of peace.

* *Vere in cappella illa refulsit omnimodo maiestas papalis, cum in S. Petro non nisi difficulter appareat maiestas, et melius esset, hic semper celebrare quam in S. Petro propter angustiam illius loci. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.*

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 1991. Cf. *Mél. d'Arch.*, XXII., 275.

‡ PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

§ JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 3; RANKE (*Germ. und rom. Völker*) 301, changes "Possesso" for coronation. The towns of the States of the Church were called on to send the customary gifts for the "Possesso"; see *Brief to Perugia, dat. 1513, March 29, in the Communal Library, Perugia.

|| See *Letter of Gabbioneta to Mantua, dated Rome, 1513, April 10, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Also the *Letter of Frate Anselmo, dat. Rome, 1513, March 19.

On the 10th of April, at the request of Bibbiena* and of Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona, certain censures pronounced on Duke Alfonso of Ferrara by Julius II. were removed,† in order that that prince might be able to take part in the solemnity arrayed in all his ducal splendour.

The weather smiled on the triumphal procession; and when this had been marshalled by Paris de Grassis, Master of Ceremonies, the Pope appeared. The Duke of Ferrara led his horse, and held the bridle till the fountain in the Piazza of St. Peter's was reached. There he was relieved by Francesco Maria della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, Giovan Maria da Varano, Lord of Camerino, and the Pope's nephew, Lorenzo de' Medici.‡

The procession was the most magnificent spectacle which Rome had witnessed since the days of the Emperors.§ It was headed by two hundred mounted

* This fact is given by the erudite author in chap. ix. of the rare pamphlet: *Risposta alla invectiva di D. Alphonso Duca di Ferrara*, fol. A, 4.

† Leo X. to Duke Alfonso, dat. Rome, 1513, April 10. (Regest. Leonis X., ed. HERGENRÖTHER, n. 2118-2119.) Orig. in the State Archives, Modena.

‡ The two first mentioned had come to Rome on the 7th of April. *Diary of a Frenchman living in Rome. Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

§ The "Possesso" of Leo X. is described in detail:—1. By Paris de Grassis in GATTICUS, 382-385. (Some short passages, not without interest, are omitted in Gatticus. Thus (384) the following words, found in the MS., XII., 23, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, should be added after "diruperunt": et nisi pontifex cum suis palatinis stipendiariis obviasset, omnia consumpsissent.) 2. J. PENNI, *Chronica delle magnifiche ed onorate pompe fatte in Roma per la creazione et incoronazione di P. Leone X.*, P.O.M. (Rome, 1513); incomplete in CANCELLIERI, *Possessi*, 67-84, complete in ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 189-231. 3. The Venetian Envoys and other Venetians, printed in SANUTO, XVI., 160 *seqq.*, 678 *seqq.* 4. M. Equicola, see REUMONT-

lancers, and the inferior members of the household of the Pope and Cardinals. The bands of musicians who attended these, wearing the Papal livery of white, red, and green, with the Medici badge on their breasts, were a brilliant sight. Then followed the standards of the twelve Papal *cursori* and the thirteen representatives of the Rioni, and the banner of the University, with its device of a flame-coloured cherub. The great red standard of Rome, with its golden letters S.P.Q.R. (*Senatus Populusque Romanus*) was borne by Giovan Giorgio Cesarini. With him ranked the Procurator of the Teutonic Order of Knights, carrying their white banner surmounted by a black cross; the Prior of the Knights of St. John with the banner of the Order—red silk with a white cross. The banner of the Captain-General followed, and, last of all, the *Gonfaloniere* of the Church.

Then came the Papal Marshal, with nine white horses and three white mules, with red trappings embroidered in gold; the Master of the Horse, clad in red, and the numerous chamberlains of honour, two of whom carried the mitre, set with pearls and precious stones, and two others the tiara, decorated with priceless gems. The brilliant group of knights, of the Roman and Florentine nobility, recalled

BASCHET, *Cath. de Médicis*, 241–242. With these eye-witnesses *cf.* the description of Tizio in FABRONIUS, 270–274; JOVIUS, *Leo X.*, I. 3; GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4, and later REUMONT, III., 2, 56 *seqq.*; GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 168; CASTELNAU, II., 341 *seqq.*; MÜNTZ, *Raphäel*, 416 *seqq.*, and SCHULTE, I., 197 *seqq.* About festivals of the 16th Century in general, see BURCKHARDT, *Gesch. der Renaissance* (Holtzinger), 372. Among unprinted reports I have made use of the *Letter of Gabbioneta, dat. Rome, 1513, April 13 (see also the *Letter of Card. S. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, 1513, April 11), and *Nota del l'ordine tenuto nel cavalcare a S. Janni a di della coronatione di N. S. a di XI. d'Aprile 1513, in *Carte Strozzi*, 235, f. 1, State Archives, Florence. *Cf.* *Jahrb. der Kunstam. des österr. Kaiserhauses*, XXIII., 20., also LUZIO, *Isabella d'Este*, 92 *seq.*

the mediæval history of Italy. There were the Colonna, Orsini, Savelli, Conti, Santa Croce, Gaetani, Medici, Soderini, Tornabuoni, Salviati, Pucci, Strozzi, all magnificently arrayed, and each attended by a numerous and brilliant suite. This stately procession included the diplomatic body; first the Envoys of the provinces and towns belonging to the States of the Church; then the Ambassadors from Florence, Venice, Spain, and France; and lastly, riding between Jacopo Salviati and the Senator of Rome, the representative of the Empire. At the end of the cavalcade of gentlemen who bore no arms, could be seen the Duke of Urbino, clad in mourning for the death of his uncle, Julius II., and the nephew of Leo X., Lorenzo de' Medici.

The spiritual court of the Pope presented a picture no less brilliantly coloured: first there were the ostiarii, then the three apostolic sub-deacons, carrying a great gold cross, preceded the white palfreys, which carried on their backs the tabernacle, containing the Most Holy Sacrament, over which four Roman citizens held a canopy, surrounded by twenty-five grooms with wax torches. Immediately behind came the sacristan, with a white staff in his hand, a secretary, and a consistorial advocate. The two accompanying "sea-prefects" recalled a time long since passed.

The Papal choir followed, then the clerics of the apostolic treasury, the consistorial advocates, and the Master of the Sacred Palace. After these came two hundred and fifty abbots, bishops and archbishops, and lastly the Cardinals, according to their rank, each accompanied by eight chamberlains. Between Cardinal Gonzaga and Cardinal Petrucci could be seen Alfonso of Ferrara, clad in his ducal mantle, embroidered in gold. Then followed the Swiss Guard, magnificent men, of erect carriage, with glittering armour and picturesque uniform. These heralded the approach of the Pope.

Under a canopy, borne by Roman citizens, rode Leo X., attired with all the insignia of his Papal dignity, and his tiara, sparkling with jewels, on his head. He was mounted on the same Turkish horse which he was riding a year previously, when taken prisoner by the French at the bloody battle of Ravenna. The Holy Father was immediately followed by the Maestro di Camera and several other chamberlains, by whom gold and silver coins were thrown among the crowd.* A number of protonotaries followed, and, finally, the *macarius* with the Pope's ombrellino. Four hundred knights wound up the procession.

An immense crowd filled all the streets of the so-called "via papale," through which the procession had to pass on its long journey to the Lateran. Even nature seemed to share in the general joy, for it was one of those glorious days of a Roman spring, when the sun, shining out of the deep blue sky, sheds a blinding light over everything.

Near the bridge of St. Angelo there was erected a stand for the representatives of the Jewish community in Rome, in front of which the Pope stopped in order to

* JOVIUS (*Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 3) says that the Pope declared that this act of generosity cost him tons of gold. According to GUICCIARDINI, X., 4, the whole amount came to 100,000 ducats; but according to SANUTO, XVI., 158, to as much as 150,000. Frate Anselmo, in his *Letter to Mantua, dat. Rome, 1513, April 12 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), puts it at only 8000. This estimate is certainly too low, and the others too high. The *Register of Leonardo di Zanobi Bartholini, fol. 26, 26^b (State Archives, Rome), says the expenses of the coronation and the "Possesso" may be put at 45,369 golden ducats, including "1286 duc. a dipintori della incoronazione; 1737 duc. a Giuliano Leno et altri per le opere fece a S. Piero e a S. Janni per la incoronazione; 230 duc. a M. Antonio da S. Gallo et altri per lavoro di sopra." A great portion of the expenses were undoubtedly defrayed by private individuals, as, for example, Chigi (*cf.* Arch. d. Soc. Rom., II., 478).

receive, according to custom, the scroll of the law, and signify his rejection of its false interpretation. On the further end of the same bridge the first of the triumphal arches was erected, on which this inscription could be read: "To Leo the Tenth, the promoter of ecclesiastical unity and peace among Christian nations." At the entrance to the Via Giulia there stood a second arch. Many others were erected on the way to the Lateran. Inside that basilica, reaching from the portico to the high altar, a stage was put up, about ten feet high and twenty broad, for the exclusive use of those who took part in the ceremony. After all the usual ceremonies had been performed in the Council Hall, the Chapel of St. Silvester, and the *sancta sanctorum*, a brilliant banquet was prepared in the Palace. Dusk set in during the return journey, and the illumination of the houses had begun.

The streets which formed the processional route were decorated with silken draperies, either worked in gold or painted, mingled with garlands of foliage and bright flowers. All the windows were full of spectators, while crowds thronged round the houses, keeping up their cry of "Leo!" or "Palle, palle!" The lower clergy of the city, in order to pay their homage to the Supreme Head of the Church, clustered round the beautifully adorned altars which were set up at intervals along the streets. In marked contrast with these were the antique statues which had been placed in front of some of the houses. In still greater contrast were the numerous triumphal arches, which "after the manner of ancient Rome," as says Giovio, were the chief adornment of the city on this festal occasion. On the very first of these, which had been set up by Raffaello Petrucci, Bishop of Grosseto and Castellan of St. Angelo, facing the bridge already mentioned, there could be seen Apollo and his lyre: though alongside of him was

a representation of Christ delivering the keys to St. Peter. On the arch of the Florentine merchants could be seen the Baptism of Christ by St. John, while further on were SS. Peter and Paul, and SS. Cosmas and Damian, the patron saints of the Medici, with their arms and badges, mixed up with interesting allusions to ecclesiastical politics. The same sort of thing was to be seen on the arch put up by the Master of the Papal mint, Johannes Zink. Among other devices was a representation of kings paying homage to the Pope, and a session of the Lateran Council, with the inscription: "Thou wilt conclude the Council, and wilt be called the Reformer of the Church."

The most artistic arches had been erected by the wealthy bankers. That put up by Agostino Chigi, near his house in the Via del Banco di Santo Spirito, surpassed all the others. On it was the inscription: "To Leo the Tenth, the happy restorer of peace!" But, as befitted the worldly mind of Chigi, nearly all the figures on his arch were pagan: Apollo, Mercury, Pallas, nymphs and centaurs. Here, in golden letters, was to be read the satire, so soon to become famous, referring to the reigns of Alexander VI. and Julius II., which at the same time expressed the hopes held by the humanists as regarded Leo X.:

First Venus ruled; then came the god of war;
Now, great Minerva, it is thy day that dawns.

The celebrated goldsmith, Antonio di San Marino, responded to this in a way quite in harmony with the worldliness of Rome. He placed a statue of Venus over his house with this inscription:

Mars has reigned; Pallas has followed; but the reign
of Venus will never end.*

* REUMONT, III., 2, 57. The verse, "Olim habuit Cypria sua tempora," is by M. Ant. Casanova. Cf. F. VOLTICELLA, *Heroica M. A. Casanovae* (rare *Nozze-Publ.*) Napoli, 1867, 15 and 37. The

Italian verses also could be seen under various statues.* The arch put up in the Piazza di Parione by Ferdinando Ponzetti, the clerical chamberlain, was decorated with Perseus, Apollo, Moses, Mercury, and Diana, in addition to which was a representation of Cardinal de' Medici's rescue at the battle of Ravenna. No one was scandalized by this mixture of Christianity and paganism. One Bishop, afterwards Cardinal Andrea della Valle, adorned his arch with nothing but antique statues: Apollo, Bacchus, Mercury, Hercules, Venus. A Roman patrician, Evangelista de' Rossi, had the largest collection of antique sculptures displayed for show at his house. Innumerable were the inscriptions which hailed Leo as the patron of learning. One floral arch at the Pellicceria bore the inscription: "Destiny has been fulfilled!" The house of the Genoese banker, Sauli, had erected a truly artistic arch, from which a boy stepped forth and recited Latin verse. An inscription on this arch hailed the Pope as the day-star of peace.

On this great festival, celebrated in Leo's honour, many inscriptions and emblems alluded to the love of peace of the newly-elected Pope, who would, so said those who extolled him, extend to the wider field of his high position the gentleness and moderation by which he had been so well known heretofore. The harshness and violence of Julius II. were so fresh in the memory of all men that his fortunate successor basked in the sunshine of popularity without any particular effort on his own part. The humanists, of whom the new Pope had been, even as a Cardinal, the friend and patron, proclaimed on all sides that now the iron age had given way to the golden. No doubt

meaning attributed by the contemporaries to the inscriptions is explained by FR. NOVELLUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, Cod. Barb., lat. 2273, fol. 61, Vatican Library.

* Penni in CANCELLIERI, 77.

it was in the mind of Leo to fulfil these expectations and prove himself to be the most generous of patrons; but this was not all, for, at the beginning of his pontificate, he seemed eager to justify the good opinion held of him, on ecclesiastical and political grounds also.

As early as the 29th of March, 1513, the Pope's nephew, Giulio de' Medici, who was more versed than any, except Bibbiena, in the secrets of politics, announced to Giuliano de' Medici, the sole surviving brother of the Pope in Florence, that His Holiness's sole care henceforward would be to give to Christendom the much-needed peace, in ecclesiastical as well as in political matters.* The termination of the schism of Pisa, the prevention of fresh wars in Italy, the maintenance of the States of the Church, the union, as far as was possible, of the Christian princes for the defence of Europe against the Turks, were great undertakings, the accomplishment of which demanded a well-nigh superhuman power. The future alone could decide whether the Medici Pope was the man to do it.

The first measures of Leo X. tended to confirm the good opinion formed of his desire for peace, as well as of his prudence and magnanimity. The severity with which the conspiracy of the Boscoli against the Medicean rule in Florence had been suppressed, was not at all to his mind. The historians Giovio and Nerli are of opinion that the Pope would have wished to pardon the offenders, had not the Florentine government ordered their execution as soon as sentence had been passed on them. He did, however, succeed in effecting the liberation of the other prisoners.† The Soderini, the implacable antagonists of the Medici, were reconciled by the Pope's magnanimity. Pietro

* *Letter of Giulio de' Medici to Giuliano, dat. Rome, 1513, March 29, in NITTI, II, n. 1.

† JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, lib. 3. C/. NERLI, VI., 123-124.

Soderini, who was living in exile at Ragusa, was allowed by the Pope to return to Rome, having his confiscated possessions restored to him at the same time.* In order to put an end to enmity in the future, a marriage was proposed between a Medici and a Soderini.† Leo, further, did his best to win over the turbulent Pompeo Colonna by holding out offers of pardon and reinstatement. There was even question of a complete reconciliation with the d'Este and Bentivogli. A commission of Cardinals was appointed to negotiate with both, and in June peace was arranged with the latter.‡

Leo's attitude towards the schismatic Cardinals was one of magnanimity and forbearance. Their leaders, Carvajal and Sanseverino, were in the hands of the Florentines, and according to the Papal commands had been taken to Florence. Thither a special envoy conveyed to them reassuring messages. His Holiness, said he, would prefer mercy to justice, and would grant them pardon and restoration to their former estate if only they would make this possible to him by their submission. But, as a preliminary condition of his taking any further steps, they must consider themselves lawfully debarred from wearing the insignia of their dignity as Cardinals. The repre-

* SANUTO, XVI., 269 *seq.*; NARDI, 272. Cf. RAZZI, *Vita di P. Soderini*, 85, 127 *seq.*

† It was originally intended that Lorenzo de' Medici should marry a niece of Pietro Soderini (SANUTO, XVI., 57; VILLARI, *Machiavelli*, II., App. 13). This plan was, however, abandoned; and at length Luigi Ridolfi, son of Contessina, sister of the Pope, married the above-named (NERLI, VI., 124; NARDI, II., 32).

‡ SANUTO, XVI., 147-148, 152, 153, 179, 188, 337 *seq.*, 385. Regest. Leonis X., n. 2833, 3155, 3559. *Brief to Bologna of June 20, 1513, in State Archives, Bologna. About the efforts of Leo to make peace in Bologna, see the Briefs of Aug. 19 and Aug. 20, missing in HERGENRÖTHER, but to be found in FANTUZZI, IV., 235 *seq.*

sentative of France, Giovan Giordano Orsini, and Fabrizio Colonna interceded warmly for these unfortunate men; but Cardinals Schinner, Remolino, and Bainbridge, as well as the Spanish Ambassador, Hieronymus de Vich, strongly opposed their reconciliation. However, the Pope remained firm in his desire to grant absolution on the one condition of their submission and recantation. All further terms were to be settled by a commission of Cardinals; but, as the schismatics would not hear of submission, negotiations became very difficult.*

But Leo met with far greater difficulties in his political efforts to make peace. In the very first days after his election, it was reported that the Supreme Head of the Church was about to send peace-envoys to the Emperor, to France, Spain, England, and Venice.† It appears to be a fact that he did entertain some such project, for even before his coronation he issued Briefs, by which he sought to make peace between King Sigismund of Poland and the Grand Master, Albert of Brandenburg, alluding to the Turkish peril, which was increased by the strife of the Christians among themselves.‡ However, as Leo was to find only too soon, the Christian princes were not inclined to give a hearing to the Pontiff's exhortations in the matter of peace.

There is no doubt that the greatest danger which threatened the peace of Europe came from the ambitious French King, Louis XII., who was determined to do everything to avenge his defeat in 1512, and regain Milan. For this end he signed at Blois, on the 23rd of March, 1513, an

* SANUTO, XVI., 58, 72-74, 158, 179, 295, 307, 308, 331; GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4; ZURITA, X., 58, 74.

† SANUTO, XVI., 48.

‡ Apostolic Brief of March 16, 1513, to the Grand Master, Albert of Brandenburg, in JOACHIM, I, 223-224.

offensive alliance with the Venetian Republic, whereby the Venetians pledged themselves to bring into the field an army of 12,000 men, while at the same time—the middle of May—the French were to invade Italy from the north. According to this agreement neither party was to lay down arms until France had once more gained possession of Lombardy, and the Venetians had reconquered all that they used to hold on the mainland before the Peace of Cambrai.*

Without doubt Julius II., with his determined and stormy character, would have retaliated by severe measures for the defection of the Venetians from the Holy League and their alliance with France. Not so the peace-loving, cautious, and hesitating Leo X. However alive he might be to the evils which France had brought on his family, now that he was raised to the supreme dignity he did not wish to attach himself to any party. When the Imperial and Spanish Ambassadors, during the first days of his pontificate, made known to him the impending crisis, and urged him to declare himself openly against France, and support the League with troops and money, Leo replied that he had not been chosen to be Pope in order to make war, but rather peace; and as for money, he wished to keep the treasury of Julius II. for the defence of the States of the Church, and for warfare against the Turks. In vain, in a subsequent audience, did the Spanish Ambassador remind him of the debt of gratitude he owed to his master, who had brought the Medici back to Florence. The Pope still refused the request for a contribution of 10,000 ducats.†

Instead of declaring war openly against France and Venice, Leo endeavoured by friendly negotiations to re-

* DUMONT, IV., 1, 182 *seq.* Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 119, 121 *seq.*; also 125, 284 *seq.*, as to the publication on May 22.

† SANUTO, XVI., 72, 73, 129, 133.

strain both powers from making war. He had already expressed his hopes of peace in a Brief drawn up by Bembo, in which he had announced his election to the Doge.*

To Foscari, the Venetian Ambassador, he protested that he loved the Republic, though he warned him emphatically against anything so hazardous as an alliance with France. The Ambassador denied the existence of any such treaty. It was only when, on the 13th of April, 1513, Leo turned for an explanation to his new Nuncio in Venice, Pietro Bibbiena, that the Venetian Ambassador owned for the first time to the league formed between the two States. Though he did not dare to tell the Pope the whole truth, he remarked plainly how much displeased His Holiness was by the projected seizure of Milan by the French. The Ambassador sums up his opinion of the attitude of Leo X. by saying that his chief wish was to remain neutral, and watch which State would be favoured by the fortune of war. In spite of the efforts of the Spanish and Imperial Ambassadors to bring him over to their side, Foscari was able to say, on the 8th of April, that the Pope still remained neutral. It was certain that he did not want to see the French in Italy.†

On his side Louis made every offer which could have gained the support of Leo X. For this end he appealed to the Pope's brother, Giuliano de' Medici, and gave him to understand how much he hoped that Leo would not oppose his proceedings against Milan. Should he do so, the King would not carry out his plans of conquest, and would even leave the conditions of peace in the hands of

* SANUTO, XVI., 50-51. Cf. Vol. VIII., Appendix, No. 22.

† *Ibid.*, 130, 133, 148, 153, 159, 170-171, 172-173, 179. As to the mission of Bibbiena to Venice, see PIEPER, *Nuntiaturen*, 48 *seq.* Cf. MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 1203.

the Supreme Head of the Church. Giuliano, being a partisan of France, supported the request of Louis XII., but Leo X. met it with much reserve. He did not, indeed, consider it advisable to oppose the King directly, but sought rather to turn him from his warlike projects by friendly representations and the promise of such future advantages as might induce him to delay his expedition. But Louis did not trust the promises of the Pope, for he could see his real object was to prevent the conquest of Milan.* Even after Louis had succeeded in agreeing with Spain for a year's truce † for the purpose of arranging the Italian campaign, he remained more bent than ever on regaining his lost prestige.

Meanwhile the condition of Milan had become such, that she saw herself compelled to invite France to take possession. The weak, frivolous Duke, Maximilian Sforza, was so unequal to the situation that the chronicler Prato applied to him the words of Scripture: "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child." ‡ The Swiss as well as the Spaniards, on whom the Duke relied, had made themselves so hated in Lombardy by their extortions, that many there longed for the restoration of the French occupation.§ Threatened by this imminent danger, the Duke of Milan turned for help to Leo X. as well as to Switzerland. In spite of the blandishments of France, that country remained true to Sforza, because they could scarcely hope to obtain the payment promised to them from any other

* GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4; SADOLETI, Epist. Pontif., n. 10, 11; Regest. Leonis X., n. 2348; ROSCOE-BOSSI, IV., 32; NITTI, 14; WIRZ, Filonardi, 10 *seq.*

† The Spanish Ambassador in Rome disowned the truce from the beginning, *cf.* SANUTO, XVI., 179.

‡ PRATO, 309.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4.

Duke of Milan.* But it was much more difficult to gain the support of the still hesitating Pope. In the hope of gaining it, the highly-gifted Girolamo Morone was sent to Rome in April. He pointed out emphatically that action—serious action—must be taken, if the many efforts made by Julius II. for the liberty of Italy were not to remain fruitless, and all that he had accomplished called in question. Parma and Piacenza, as the Envoy pointed out, must inevitably fall into the hands of the French if Sforza were not supported. Cardona, the Viceroy of Naples, had taken possession of them in the name of Milan after the death of Julius II. It was not till the beginning of May, 1513, that Leo X. arranged for their restoration.†

Morone's representations were supported by the Emperor's Envoys, who painted in the blackest colours the danger of the French supremacy which must necessarily follow the occupation of Lombardy. Morone declared over and over again that the Pope alone could help, for Spain was no longer to be counted on; it was in his power to open the treasury of Julius II. and subsidize the Swiss, and in this way save Milan. An old enemy of France, Cardinal Schinner, who had at that time much influence with Leo X.,‡ pointed out to him the strength of the fighting population of Switzerland. But above all he urged the necessity of upholding the Papal reputation.§ Leo would willingly have still deferred his decision, had not a new combination among the powers put an end to all hesitation.

* DIERAUER, II., 424.

† SANUTO, XVI., 49, 58, 68, 72, 129, 179, 223, 225, 259; Regest. Leonis X., n. 2421-2423; BALAN, V., 497.

‡ Cf. the account of P. Falk in *Anz. für Schweiz. Gesch.*, 1892, 375.

§ JOVIUS, Hist., XI., 160-161; SANUTO, XVI., 188, 191, 216, 217; *Miscell. d. stor. Ital.*, II., 311, 322, III., 28 *seq.*

On the 5th of April, 1513, a Holy League was formed at Mechlin between the Emperor Maximilian and the English King, Henry VIII., Leo X. and Ferdinand of Spain being named as their allies. It was agreed that France should be attacked on four sides at once, and rendered incapable, by her dismemberment, of destroying the peace of Europe.* But even after this powerful anti-French league had been formed, Leo maintained for some time an entirely neutral position. The more the Imperial and Spanish Ambassadors urged the ratification of the League of Mechlin, the more reluctant was he to declare himself openly as belonging to it.† Nevertheless the actual circumstances pointed unquestionably to the necessity of decision on his part. The French army of invasion was already encamped at the foot of the Alps, and Leo could not long escape the danger of being isolated. But the manner in which he finally made up his mind is very characteristic of his policy.

The historian Paolo Giovio describes the hesitation of Leo at this important moment.‡ Although the Pope—as was inevitable with a new sovereign—had not yet developed his political programme, he had made up his mind that the course which his predecessor had taken from mature and serious conviction, was to be followed no longer. At all costs Julius would have upheld in Milan the restored Duke, Maximilian Sforza; and have considered the alliance with the brave, faithful, and victorious Swiss as a thing profitable and honourable for the Holy See. But even while Leo X. recognized in himself the official prosecutor of Julius's policy, he believed that it behoved him to maintain a certain reserve, as far as was compatible with blaming no

* DUMONT, IV., 1, 173 *seqq.*; BERGENROTH, II., n. 97; HENNE, I., 330 *seqq.*

† SANUTO, XVI., 223, 225, 227, 270, 292, 295, 305.

‡ JOVIUS, *loc. cit.* 161, and Vita Leonis X., l. 3.

one openly, and thus to retain the title of peacemaker, so befitting to a Pope. On one side, therefore, he tried to keep up the courage of France's enemies; on the other, he wished to avoid the appearance of being too harsh with that country. For the power of France was great, both on account of its own strength and its alliance with Venice: and who could foretell how matters would turn out in the field of war? One circumstance, not mentioned by Giovio, but which must have had an undoubted influence in overcoming the hesitation of Leo X., was the continuance of the schism in France. Even were he compelled to follow the path adopted by his predecessor, nevertheless the restoration of ecclesiastical unity forbade him from cutting off all communication with France.

Out of such hesitation there grew the resolve to stand by the Holy League, and pay the money required for subsidizing the mercenaries in the service of Milan, by which alone that state could be saved. But how anxious the Pope was not to let himself be robbed of the prospect of an understanding with France, can be seen by the fact that the payment was to be made quite secretly. It is true that the subvention was officially denied, but the truth leaked out by reason of the clause in the agreement, which appointed that 20,000 ducats of the whole sum should be devoted to pensioning certain distinguished personages, while the balance of 22,000 was to be paid to the Swiss mercenaries.*

* GUICCIARDINI, XI., 4. JOVIUS (*Vita Leonis X.*, l. 3) mentions the sum of 25,000 ducats; SANUTO (XVI., 307-308) only 20,000. In the account given by the Venetian Ambassador, which we have drawn on, it transpires that the fact of the contribution, though officially denied (SANUTO, XVI., 331, 354, 356, 357, 364), was acknowledged for the first time on May 25. The first sign given by Leo X. that he meant to belong to the League is the instruction sent to Bologna on the 19th of May, to go to the help of the imperialists at Verona, while

The conduct of the Pope shows how willingly he would even then have adopted a policy of delay. But this was no longer possible. Nevertheless, though he actually adhered to the political arrangements made by his predecessor, he did not join the anti-French league openly, and most anxiously avoided anything which could exasperate either the French or the Venetians.*

Knowing that everything depended on promptitude, the French had begun hostilities in May, and had advanced on Asti and Alessandria with 14,000 men, while the Venetians were advancing simultaneously from the east. As the Spaniards remained inactive, Maximilian Sforza was in the greatest danger. Shut up in Novara, the Duke seemed to be lost, when a brilliant feat on the part of the Swiss changed the whole aspect of affairs. Early on the 6th of June, they, with heroic contempt of death, attacked the French army in the open plain of Novara, and defeated them so completely that those who remained fled to Turin, and thence over the Mont Cenis. The cities of Lombardy bought the favour of the Duke, while the Venetians retired eastward. At Genoa the French abandoned all hope, and the Adorni willingly gave up the city, where Ottaviano Fregoso, the friend of Leo X., was elected Doge.†

When the news of the battle of Novara reached Rome on the evening of the 10th of June, all the enemies of France rejoiced. Bonfires were lighted, and the cry of

on the 23rd and 31st of May similar instructions were given in favour of the Spaniards and imperialists combined (Regest. Leonis X., n. 2726, 2807, 2918). About the Papal pensions in Switzerland, see WIRZ, Filonardi, 15 *seq.*

* JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. 3 ; *Lettres de Louis XII.*, IV. 114.

† JOVIUS, *Hist.*, XI., 167 ; GUICCIARDINI, XI., 5. For the battle of Novara, see GISI, 108 *seq.*, and DIERAUER, II., 428 *seq.*, where can be found a good epitome of the events of this important fight.

"Julius II." resounded through the streets,* and Cardinal Schinner had the bells of his titular church rung.† But from the Pope alone nothing was heard of a celebration of the victory.‡

Although, however, one of Leo's most influential advisers, Bernardo Bibbiena, now went over entirely to the side of the French,§ and finally did all he could to bring the Supreme Pontiff over to his views, Leo persisted in maintaining a more neutral attitude. The Imperial Ambassador demanded help for the subjugation of Venice; Henry VIII. added the request that Leo X. would join the Anglo-Imperial alliance and occupy the southern side of the Alps with an army;|| but the Pope declared that in his position as Father of Christendom he was bound to refrain from siding openly with any party. In his letters of congratulation, he exhorted the victors to observe mercy and peace, which was so essential in view of the increasing danger from the Turks. On all sides he issued Briefs advocating reconciliation; and tried to get once more into sympathy with France, whose open enemy he had never declared himself. On June the 17th the Venetian Am-

* This is expressly mentioned by Gabbioneta in a *Despatch, dat. Rome, 1513, June 10 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 369, 384.

† STETTLER, I, 491.

‡ The "Pope's brilliant feasts" of which GREGOROVIVS speaks (VIII., 3, 179) exist only in the fertile imagination of that author. Paris de Grassis, the great enemy of the French, would most surely have mentioned them had they existed. The "*Diary of a Frenchman living in Rome" says nothing of any such feasts (Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library). Neither does the Dutchman, Cornelius de Fine, say anything about them in his *sketches (National Library, Paris).

§ This important statement is to be found in a document by V. Lippomano, in SANUTO, XVI., 384.

|| See Carpi's account in the Vienna Archives, ULMANN, II., 459.

bassador announced that there was no fear of the Pope taking any hostile steps against Venice, as he thought a great deal more about the Turkish peril than he did about the unity of Italy, but that the downfall of the French had given him real joy.* That this was the case is not to be doubted, and can easily be understood, for the humbled French King would be now constrained to seek reconciliation with Rome, and abandon the cause of the schismatics. In fact, the immediate consequence of the victory of Novara was the end of the schism, the submission of the recalcitrant Cardinals, and the adherence of France to the Council of the Lateran.

When he first reopened that Council, Leo X. had expressed his fixed determination to put an end to the schism, not by severity, but by the gentlest methods possible. At the sixth session of the Council, when the Procurator, Mario de Perusco, moved that the absent prelates should be cited, and proceedings against the French Pragmatic Sanction resumed, the Pope adjourned a decision out of consideration for Louis XII. Further, at the seventh session, on the 17th of June, the eighth was postponed until November, out of consideration for those among the French prelates who had adduced valid reasons for their absence. At the same time the Pope solemnly declared that he intended to send Legates to all the Christian powers, with the object of restoring peace to Europe.

On this occasion the Secretary of the Council read out a declaration, signed by themselves, in which Bernardino Carvajal and Federigo de Sanseverino—who purposely did not call themselves Cardinals—repudiated the Council of Pisa, recognised the Lateran Council, and asked for

* SANUTO, XVI., 385, 399. Letters to the victors in BEMBI epist., III., 1, 2, 3, 4; IV., 1. Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 3144, and WIRZ, Filonardi, 17.

absolution.* There was a long discussion before this point was conceded.† The commission of Cardinals had secretly handed over the decision of the affair to the Pope, who was in favour of compromise and pardon, if the schismatics would acknowledge their guilt and beg for absolution. When, in the declaration read, they professed their readiness to do this, nearly the whole of the Sacred College decided in favour of their reconciliation.

Only the English Cardinal, Bainbridge, and the Swiss, Schinner, were in favour of withholding absolution, being supported in this by the Imperial and Spanish Ambassadors. This party, recalling the rigour of Julius II., represented that the reinstatement of the schismatics would injure the credit of the Holy See, and be a bad precedent for the future. Leo X., however, adhered to his opinion. He hoped, and rightly, to destroy schism and reconcile France by gentleness rather than by severity. In the last decisive session, Schinner threw himself at the feet of the Pope and craved permission to leave the Council hall, as he was unable to hold communion with the recreants. But the Pope and the majority of the Cardinals remained of the opinion that, saving the honour of the Holy See, the good of the Church demanded that absolution should be granted.‡

* RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 24, 43; SANUTO, XVI., 359 *seq.*, 400. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 562, 566 *seq.*, 570 *seq.*; GUGLIA, Studien, 19; see Appendix, No. 4, the *Report of Gabbioneta of June 17, 1513. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 361, 369; JOVIUS, Hist., XI., 191; GUICCIARDINI, XI., 6; *Letters of Gabbioneta, dat. Rom., 1513, May 8 and June 17. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ How strongly the Pope adhered to this opinion is shewn by the following passage from the Diary of Paris de Grassis, which is missing in Raynaldus: *Et simul tandem nos duo consultavimus super ceremoniis agendis in hoc actu, quas omnes voluit quod ego visitans eos

It was decided that the schismatic Cardinals, still deprived of their insignia, should come to Rome by night, go straight to the Vatican, and next morning, clad as simple ecclesiastics, should ask for absolution at the Consistory.* According to pre-arrangement this took place on the 27th of June. The whole court, and many curious spectators, assembled to witness the unusual scene.† For the proud Carvajal it was a terrible humiliation, and, as an eye-witness testifies, his whole body shook with emotion.‡ Then the Pope, speaking earnestly, put their offence before them both.

nomine S. S^{is} indicarem eisdem scismaticis, qui si ipsi non vellent obedire, quantum ipse eisdem praecepit, nec etiam admitterentur ad gratiam restitutionis et veniae. Itaque exequutus iussa inveni eos duros ad nonnulla facienda, super quibus pontificem orabant, ut eis aliquantulum deferret et non pateretur ipsos quodammodo vituperari, maxime ut absque birreto rubeo et absque rochetto et absque caputio, quod papaticum vocant, et quod in eo habitu per omnes salas sive aulas palatii pontificalis procederent, et quod non nominarentur scismatici neque heretici in processu legendo; sed huiusmodi petitionibus papa non satisfaciens voluit, quod severe et rigore omnia fierent prout ordinavit, quod si ad verba aliquorum cardinalium attendisset, ipsis nunquam parcere deberet, aut saltem quod ipsi ab ecclesia Lateranensi usque ad palatium per pedes in eo quem dixi habitu venirent, et tandem ipsi quamquam non spontanei, sed quodammodo coacti paruerunt et se omnia facturos promiserunt ut infra dicam. Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

* See Appendix, No. 4, for the *Letter of Gabbioneta of June 17, 1513. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† *Itaque hoc ipso mane, quo consistorium fuit, tot gentes tantusque populorum concursus in palatio fuit huius spectaculi videndi causa, ut vix ibidem in tribus aulis et per scalas et per aulas superiores et per cubicula pontificis omnia vix atque aegre caperentur gentes illae, aliquando etiam dubitatum fuit de ruina aularum superiorum prae multitudine turbarum. PARIS DE GRASSIS, Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

‡ See Appendix, No. 5, for the *Letter of Gabbioneta of June 30, 1513. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

He declared the necessity of penance, and proposed to them the following form of abjuration:—

“We, Bernardino Carvajal and Federigo Sanseverino, who have been enveloped in the cloud of schism, being now enlightened by divine grace, fully acknowledge the error of schism by which we were held fast. We desire to include in what we now say every declaration we have hitherto made, whether privately or before notaries and witnesses, as though they were expressed here verbally. After long and mature deliberation we renounce all these entirely and in all sincerity, not from fear—for we are in a safe place and perfect liberty—being recalled by divine grace into the unity of the Apostolic See. That this conversion may not be considered hypocritical or simulated, we humbly beg Your Holiness and the Sacred College of Cardinals for absolution from our errors. And we implore Your Holiness to intercede for us before the Most High God, whose representative you are on earth. In the event of our being reinstated by your mercy in our rank and dignity of the cardinalate, we freely vow and promise, under the ban of anathema, to you, Pope Leo X., the true and undoubted Vicar of Christ, and through you to the Prince of the Apostles, Peter, that never, for whatever cause or reason, or on whatever plea or pretext, will we return to the state of schism from which we have been delivered by the grace of our Redeemer. We will always live in unity of the Holy Catholic Church and in true obedience to Your Holiness. Moreover we undertake to live with our lords the Cardinals in peace and friendship, without seeking cause for quarrelling or giving provocation. This we say with regard to what we have already said about the past.

“We swear by the Almighty God and by the Book of the Gospels which we hold in our hands, that we will remain in the aforesaid unity of the Church, and will

observe all and everything that we have promised, and this under penalty of perjury and other penalties. And having abjured the above-mentioned schism, both by what we have ourselves written, and in the document read before the holy Council of the Lateran, so do we now, in order to prove our sincerity of heart, explicitly anathematize the Council of Pisa, its convention, and all and everything promulgated by it. We acknowledge, hold, and declare everyone of its transactions to be null, empty, vain, and without significance, and as the audacious actions of unauthorized persons. On the other hand we declare the holy Council of the Lateran to be the only true Council ; we acknowledge that it was convened in a legitimate and just manner, and for a lawful purpose ; and that all and everything that it has pronounced, whether generally or individually against us, as well as all the sentences and judgments pronounced against us by Pope Julius, as also all that has been pronounced in condemnation of the Council of Pisa, has been done in a fitting, lawful, and just manner.

“ This we say, this we believe, this we confess absolutely. We furthermore promise to undertake and perform joyfully and humbly any penance which His Holiness may see good to impose on us for our offences. We consider ourselves as bound by all the aforesaid penalties, and by all others pronounced by the sacred canons against schismatics : and we promise before all here present to observe all that we have undertaken. We beg the notary here present to have one or more copies made, in the full form used by the Chamber, of what we have said, and of all the occurrences regarding this document.”

Carvajal and Sanseverino having read and signed this declaration, the Pope pronounced the form of absolution. Then with due solemnity they were both received back into the Sacred College, and their offices were restored to them,

so far as these had not been given to others.* All the Cardinals, with the exception of Riario, who was ill, and Bainbridge and Schinner, who persisted in their resistance, were present at the ceremony.†

The Christian powers were informed of the important event by dignified Briefs.‡

While Leo X. was on the one hand receiving the schismatic Cardinals back to favour, on the other he meditated making advances to meet the wishes of Louis XII. However, about this time, his attitude towards France changed into one that was more inimical. Hitherto he had carefully avoided any open participation in the war. But suddenly a change took place which perplexed the Venetian Ambassador.§ The impetus to this change was given by the attitude taken by Venice. After the defeat of the French at Novara, Leo X. offered his mediation for the imperilled Republic, and accompanied his offer by the expression of the greatest affection. But Venice declared herself to be opposed to any negotiations which did not comprise the restoration to her of Verona and Vicenza on

* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 45 *seq.*; the following concluding passage is missing: *Facto actu papa tenuit secum in prandio duos illos cardinales restitutos, qui demum hora XXI. iverunt versus urbem cum ingenti pompa quasi ipsi fuerint victores. Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 429, 432 *seq.*; ZURITA, X., 74; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 572 *seq.*

† That Schinner remained irreconcilable can be seen by his passionate utterances in SANUTO, XVI., 482. See also PETRUS MARTYR, Epist., 125. It was certainly not without the influence of Schinner, who visited Switzerland in the following July (SANUTO, XVI., 499, 533, 548), that the confederates showed their disapprobation of the absolution of the Cardinals: cf. Abschiede III., 2, 752.

‡ Brief to the Doge, SANUTO, XVI., 479 *seq.* Cf. Regest. Leonis X. n. 3373 *seq.*

§ Cf. the account of June 25, 1513, in SANUTO, XVI., 426.

the part of the Emperor. This obstinacy exasperated the Pope, especially as the Venetian troops were giving themselves over to pillage in the territories of Parma and Piacenza. Moreover the Signoria had, against all precedent, unreasonably delayed the offering of their *obedientia* to the Holy See, and had brought themselves to do it only when there was nothing more to be hoped for from France.*

This being the case, the Pope was not inclined to show any particular consideration towards Venice, when the Emperor urgently begged for the help of a contingent of 200 men of the Papal troops to send against the Republic. This request of the Emperor came at a most unfortunate time for the Pope, in so far as it came in the way of his attempted reconciliation with France. But as to Venice, when given choice between offending the Emperor or her by such a trifle, there could be no doubt as to his decision, and he agreed to the Imperial demand, wishing to remain true to the treaty made by Julius II. with Maximilian.† The Venetians were alarmed by this event, which made them fear that the Pope would now pass over entirely to

* Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 175, 298, 420, 423 *seq.*, 481. It is uncertain whether the plot made during the vacancy of the Holy See, between Venice, Ravenna, and Cervia, to despoil it (ROMANIN, V., 282 ; BALAN, V., 498), was known to the Pope.

† GUICCIARDINI, XI., 6. Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 426, 481. I found the *Brief, mentioned here, to the Marquis of Mantua, dat. Rome, 1513, June 23, as to whether the passage of his soldiers through Verona would be required, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. There likewise is the Brief to Alfonso I., dat. Rome, 1513, June 24, saying that he might send a few *tormenta bellica* to the Viceroy Cardona for the defence of Verona. Orig. in State Archives, Modena. Cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 3333. Leo X. seemed now to favour the warlike projects of England. Cf. the letter of June 25 in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 57, which, however, as maintains FERRAJOLI (Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XIX., 435), "non usciva da una approvazione generica."

the side of their enemy. Leo, for his part, made use of this frame of mind to try to compel them to a reconciliation with the Emperor, and added the threat that he would make the cause of their opponents his own.* To give more weight to his endeavours to secure peace, the Pope sent a Nuncio-extraordinary † to Venice at the end of June, who was directed to lay great stress on the Turkish peril. The Pope explained to the Venetian Ambassador, Foscari, that he had been compelled to afford to the Emperor the trifling assistance demanded, but that though he wished to see the French driven out of Italy, his feelings towards Venice were far from hostile. On the contrary, he would do everything in his power to bring about an honourable peace between the Republic and the Empire. At the same time, he pointed out that Venice could no longer look for help from France, hard pressed as was that country at home by the fear of an invasion of the English.‡

Even Foscari had to acknowledge the good-will of the Pope; still the Venetians adhered to their hopeless demand for the restoration by the Empire of Verona and Vicenza. Foscari was in a difficult position. The Pope on his side threatened to espouse the cause of the enemies of the Republic, by making use of his weapons, both spiritual and temporal; while, on the other hand, Venice tried to raise alarm in Rome by giving it to be understood that

* SANUTO, XVI., 428, 429, 450, 475, 481. Other indications of the Pope's hostile attitude towards the French are not wanting. Connected with this are the enactments in favour of Henry VIII. (Regest. Leonis X., n. 3271, 3272), and an incident that took place on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, related by Paris de Grassis, see Regest. Leonis X., p. 201.

† Gentile Sindesio, called Pindaro, see SANUTO, XVI., 445, 468, 485. Cf. PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 48 *seq.*

‡ SANUTO, XVI., 426, 499, 513.

she would, if necessary, call in the help of the Turks.* But Leo X. did not allow himself to be turned from his object. At the end of July he said to the Secretary of the Venetian Embassy, who was carrying on the business during the illness of Foscari, that the attitude of Venice was such as to prevent the thought of either peace or truce. Two leagues, said he, would have to be formed, one against the Turks and the other against Venice. In August Leo said to Foscari himself: "I will offer no further mediation, for I see that you expect everything from France. If she wins, she will make herself the mistress of Italy; if she loses, every State will turn against you."†

The Signoria turned a deaf ear to all Leo's exhortations. Even the news of the invasion of France by the Swiss, and the victory which the English, led by the Emperor Maximilian, had gained over the French on the 16th August in the skirmish of Guinegate, as well as the rumoured negotiations for the formation of a league between the Pope and Spain, produced no change in the purpose of the Republic. In Rome it was asked: What will Venice do now? and the invariable answer was that she would call in the assistance of the Turks. The Pope did not take this threat seriously, and renewed his negotiations with Foscari, and in October with his successor, Lando, but with no better success than before.‡ He acted in the same way with the Germans. The Pope tried to urge them to peace as well as the Venetians. With this object he decided to send Lorenzo Campeggio to Maximilian in Flanders on the 14th of September.§ The

* SANUTO, XVI., 513, 557.

† *Ibid.*, 587, 663.

‡ Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 557, 587, 663; XVII., 22, 30 *seq.*, 47 *seq.*, 52, 67, 99, 162, 179, 204.

§ As early as the middle of August the Pope had told the Cardinals

secret instructions to this Nuncio are one of the most important documents for revealing the policy of Leo X. during the first years of his pontificate. The Medici Pope was inclined to conceal his intentions as much as possible in order to avoid future inquiries as to their result. Campeggio was therefore directed to keep his instructions quite secret, even so far as to have them written in cipher. These conditions enhance the value of the instructions to no ordinary degree, because few other documents could give the same insight into the objects of the Papal policy. First, the Nuncio is directed to ferret out Maximilian's intentions as to the pending war, with the assurance that the Pope wishes to remain on good terms with him and his allies, seeing that this corresponds with the interests of the Holy See and the safety of Italy. Above all things the Envoy must represent to the Emperor how ardently the Pope desires the peace of Christendom, as befits his office as Vicar of Christ, and as corresponds with his natural disposition, and as is, finally, suitable to the needs of the European States, which ought to be at peace with each other so as to be able to offer more effectual resistance to the powerful and encroaching empire of the Ottomans. If, however, the Emperor is determined to declare war, it is necessary that he should provide for the union of the allies, and decide whether he will fight France or Venice; for to contend against two such mighty

of his intention to send Campeggio to the Emperor, F. Fregoso to England, and L. Canossa to France. It was soon to be seen that the mission of Canossa was put off. (SANUTO, XVI., 652, 653.) Although the instructions given are dated Sept. 14, the faculties were given only on Oct. 11 (Regest. Leonis X., n. 4928), and the appointment of a Nuncio as a permanency dates only from the end of the year. PIEPER, *Nuntiaturen*, 51-52. A drama by the humanist, Jakob Locher, was based on Leo's peace mediations; see GEIGER (*Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Lit.-Gesch.*, N.F.I., 72 *seq.*).

powers would be an impossibility. In the opinion of the Pope, peace with Venice is to be the most recommended, though it would be necessary for the Emperor to lay down conditions such as the Republic could not reasonably reject. But war should, in the Pope's opinion, be undertaken solely as the means of restoring peace to Europe. Next to his care for the welfare of all Christians, these instructions reveal Leo's zeal for the peace and independence of Italy. On this account he would wish Sforza to be upheld at Milan ; and for the same reason he would stand by England and the Emperor against France. Moreover he would not refuse reconciliation to the adherents of the Council of Pisa, if the schismatics would repent and return to the Church ; but the Emperor shall be instructed further on all these matters.*

As early as July the Emperor had arranged for peace negotiations, though, by having recourse to arms, he wished to make the terms as favourable as possible to himself.† He therefore learned with joy that the Spanish and German troops had made an attack on Venice during the last weeks of September. In thus acting the Spanish Viceroy, Cardona, had been over-precipitate, and on the 20th of October had to make a very difficult retreat. The Venetian troops followed him on foot, and on the 7th October a battle was fought not far from Vicenza, which resulted in a brilliant victory for the Imperial-Spanish

* A copy of this, signed by Bibbiena, and the secret instructions, dated from Rome, Sept. 14, 1513, in Arm. XXXI., t. 46, fol. 376-383, of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, published later by CAUCHIE in the Bull. d. la Commiss. d'hist., 5th Series, I. (1891), 31, 40. It can be seen that Guasti had already given an epitome of these instructions from the Manoscr. Torrigiani of the Florentine State Archives, in Arch. Stor. Ital., 3rd Series, XXVI., 190 *seq.*

† ULMANN, II., 477.

army.* Under the influence of their severe defeat the Venetian government decided to give to the Pope full power to make peace on the terms he wished.† On this Leo at once demanded the cessation of hostilities on the part of the Viceroy.‡ Matthæus Lang, deeply versed in the secrets of the Imperial policy, was appointed by Maximilian as his representative at the negotiations.§

While he was negotiating between the Empire and Venice, Leo was doing the same thing between England and France, urging them to make peace with one another. As he had done after the battle of Novara, so now, in his letters congratulating the King of England on his victory over the French and Scotch, he expressed the hope that the bloody struggle would now be at an end. At the same time he uttered the pious wish that the victorious arms of Henry VIII. might be turned against the Turks|| It did not enter into Leo's intentions that France should be driven to extremities. Though opposed to a French occupation of Milan, the Pope wished to keep the way open

* The Pope decided that this victory should not be celebrated in Rome. Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 78. Cf. SANUTO, XVII., 205, 217.

† SANUTO, XVII., 271 ; ULMANN, II., 482.

‡ See the Brief drawn up by Bembo on Nov. 3, 1513. SANUTO, XVII., 307-308.

§ Lang was appointed Envoy in Italy on July 12, 1513. See his *Bestallungsurkunde, in the Keeper of the State's Archives, Innsbruck, P.A.U., II., No. 99.

|| BEMBI epist., V., 19 ; RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 60. Cf. Paris de Grassis in Regest. Leonis X., n. 4918, and the *Letters of Giuliano to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1513, Oct. 6 and 8 and Nov. 1, in the State Archives. Florence, Av. il. princ. (VII.). As to the unsuccessful attempt of Henry VIII. to obtain from Leo X. a confirmation of the Brief of Julius II., giving the investiture to him with France, see RYMER, XIII., 376, 378 *seq.*, and FERRAJOLI in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XIX., 435-438

for an understanding with Louis XII., as the only means of terminating the schism and restoring unity to the Church. As early as July, Leo had sent the distinguished and truly ecclesiastical Cardinal, Robert Challand, to France to prepare the way for a reconciliation.*

On his side Louis XII. sent the Bishop of Marseilles, Claude de Seyssel, to Rome on the 24th of July. As the King had not yet repudiated the schism, his representative could not be received solemnly. He did not therefore appear in the capacity of an Envoy for the *obedientia*, but only as a simple agent.† Seyssel turned especially to Giuliano de' Medici, who was his King's friend. Nevertheless he treated immediately of only ecclesiastical matters,‡ for Louis XII. had by no means given up his plans for the conquest of Italy. To hinder him in this project, the Emperor and the Kings of England and Spain had made a treaty of alliance against France, on the 17th of October, 1513.§ It was only on learning this that Louis XII. made up his mind.

He was influenced not a little in his change of purpose by the voice of an influential body in France, who refused to recognise the lamentable anti-Papal Council, and desired a restoration of union with Rome. The influence of the Queen, who had always been opposed to the schism, weighed also in the balance.|| If, in spite of the King's

* PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 53; SANUTO, XVI., 318.

† SANUTO, XVI., 548, and ZURITA, X., 74. Cf. DUFAYARD, Cl. Seyssellii vita, Paris, 1892, 22 *seq.* The arrival in Rome of Seyssel did not take place on the 23rd of July, as is stated by MADELIN (Mél., XXII., 296), but on the 24th of July; see the * Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library), where a mistake is avoided by the addition of "Dimanche," which fell that year on the 24th of July.

‡ SANUTO, XVI., 616, 652.

§ BREWER, I., 685, 699; HUBER, III., 408.

|| GUICCIARDINI, XII., 1.

change of purpose, the negotiations for a reconciliation progressed but slowly, the reason was that, though the acceptance at Rome of the resolutions passed by the Council of Pisa was recognised as an impossibility, yet the express rejection of them by France would be accompanied by the gravest difficulties. Another great obstacle lay in the pride of Louis XII. He rebelled against the idea of asking, in so many words, for absolution from the ecclesiastical penalties which he had incurred. Apparently the die was finally cast by the verdict of Girolamo Aleander, the learned Rector of the University of Paris, whom the King had consulted, and who decided that the Council of Pisa was no longer defensible.*

Seyssel had already formed his opinion that its repudiation was the only course possible in the interests of France.† On the 6th of October, therefore, the arbitrators who had been appointed, Cardinal Sanseverino, the Protector of France, and Louis Forbin, Lord of Solier, with the Pope and four Cardinals deputed for the negotiation of this affair, drew up a solemn declaration by which Louis XII. rejected the Council of Pisa and acknowledged that of the Lateran. The act was actually drawn up by Bembo.‡

On the 26th of October Louis XII. agreed to this declaration, and appointed Seyssel and Forbin to present it at the Lateran Council.§ On the same day he authorized Cardinal Sanseverino, Seyssel, and Forbin to submit his dispute about Milan and Asti, as well as those with the Emperor, England, Switzerland, and Sforza, to the arbitra-

* MAI, *Spicil.*, II., 240 ; PAQUIER, 63.

† Cf. the interesting intimation on the subject made by Seyssel to the Venetian Ambassador, SANUTO, XVI., 587.

‡ Printed in DUMONT, IV., I, 175.

§ RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 89.

tion of the Pope.* Leo on his side attested that the French King was not included in the sentence of Julius II. against the Council of Pisa, Alfonso of Ferrara, and others, and, were he to receive absolution, it would be only for his greater safety.† His ecclesiastical reconciliation would be ratified at the eighth session of the Lateran Council, to be held on the 19th of December.

While negotiations for peace with France were in progress, Rome witnessed another great ceremony, in the shape of the *obedientia* of the Emperor. The proud Matthæus Lang had been appointed Maximilian's representative. During his visit to Rome in November, 1512, Julius II. had raised this influential adviser of the Emperor to the purple. But Lang, in order to avoid all appearance of double-dealing in his mission, had refused to receive the insignia of his office.‡ When, however, the man on whom so much depended was sent to Rome in November, 1513, accompanied by a considerable suite, Leo X. wished to send the Cardinal's hat to meet him.§ But Lang declined this. He postponed his arrival in Rome till the Pope had returned from Civitavecchia on the 17th of November, and then entered the Eternal City without any pomp. On the 19th he had a private audience with Leo X., who received him with great consideration. During the following days Lang had several interviews with the Pope, one of which lasted for five hours. The subject of their discussion was the reconciliation of Venice with the Emperor, which was

* The *original, with the signature and seal of the French King, is in the State Archives, Florence, Manosc. Torrigiani.

† HARDOUIN, IX., 1699-1700; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 579, n. 1.

‡ Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 426 *seq.*

§ TIZIO, * Hist. Senen., in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 280 (Chigi Library, Rome).

strongly urged by Leo. But Lang's demands were so exorbitant that not only the Venetian Ambassador, but the Pope himself despaired of an accommodation. Lang also put forward the most unusual claims for himself. He lived in Rome in great state, yet he dressed as a layman,* and kept his incognito so strictly that he would not go out till after dark. On one occasion this proud upstart kept the Spanish Ambassador waiting in his ante-room for such an unconscionable time, that that worthy exclaimed: "It strikes me that this man wishes to be greater than the Pope." †

An authentic account of Lang's pretensions as regarded the Pope has been given us by the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis. The haughty Envoy demanded that as representative of the Emperor he should be met by the senators and chief magistrates of the city, when he made his public entry into Rome. In the Consistory he claimed the first place, before all the Cardinals. Lang and the Master of Ceremonies had violent altercations about this and other demands of the same nature. It was at last agreed that the Imperial Envoy should receive the red hat on the 8th of December, and that he should on the following morning be conducted by all the Cardinals from his provisional dwelling to the Consistory. Moreover, precedence over the three Cardinal-deacons made in September was conceded to him. ‡

* Lang was not ordained priest until 1519. As to his life in the world, and his position in the Lutheran movement, see HAUTHALER, *Arch. für Salz. Landeskunde*, 1898.

† SANUTO, XVII., 306, 325, 326, 329, 341, 342, 348, 352, 353, 354, 364, 373, 379. As to Lang's overbearing ways, see *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 4th Series, VIII., 234, 313 *seq.*

‡ PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, 1513; * *Consistorium publ. pro admissione rev. dom. card. Gurcensis et de eiusdem ambitione et vana gloria*. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

Lang's procession to the Consistory on the 9th of December was exceedingly magnificent. His suite consisted of four hundred horsemen, and he was accompanied by several Ambassadors. When the Master of Ceremonies permitted himself to make a remark on the smallness of Lang's tonsure, and on the great length of his hair, he answered with a jest.*

On the 11th of December the Imperial Envoys for the *obedientia*, the Duke of Bari, brother of Maximilian Sforza, Alberto Pio di Carpi, Pietro Bonomo, Bishop of Trieste, and Antonio della Rovere made their entry into the Eternal City. The Pope ordered a solemn reception for them, though the French Envoy protested against the Duke of Bari acting as the representative of Milan.† The ceremony took place on the 14th of December. The discourse on the *obedientia* was delivered by Girolamo Morone. In it he allowed himself to be carried away into charging the French King with tyranny. As was but natural, the representative of Louis XII. entered a strong protest. Morone would have retorted, but was with difficulty prevented by the Master of Ceremonies. Leo X. tried to put an end to the quarrel by a conciliatory speech. As usual, he spoke well and elegantly.‡ On the 17th of December Lang dined with

* Cf. SANUTO, XVII., 380, and the *Letter of Gabbioneta, dat. Rome, 1513, Dec. 9 (Gonzaga Archives at Mantua). * PARIS DE GRASSIS (see Appendix, No. 7), Secret Archives of the Vatican. * Diary in Cod. Barb. lat. 3552 (Vatican Library). According to this source, Lang lived in the palace of the Card. of Portugal, near S. Lorenzo in Lucina.

† SANUTO, XVII., 398, and PARIS DE GRASSIS (see Appendix, No. 8), Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ * PARIS DE GRASSIS (Diarium) speaks as follows about this painful scene, which is also mentioned by SANUTO (XVII., 399) : * *Elegantissime et doctissime dixit (G. Morone) sic ut omnes admirati sint et elegantiam et ornatum ac modum dicendi, et quam animose tetigerit Gallum regem, nec inter dicendum dubitavit appellare illum inimicissi-*

Leo X. and had an audience with him of two hours' duration. Afterwards the Pope received the Spanish, and after him the Venetian Ambassador. What passed between them related to peace on the part of Maximilian and Venice.*

The eighth session of the Lateran Council was held solemnly on Sunday the 19th of December. Besides the Pope, who had gone to the Lateran the evening before, twenty-three Cardinals, eleven archbishops, forty-five bishops, five generals of religious orders, as well as the Emperor's Envoy and the Ambassadors of Spain, France, Poland, Venice, Brandenburg, Montferrat, Milan, and Rhodes took part in it. In his opening discourse, the Knight of St. John, John Baptist de Gargiis, urged a war against the Turks as a preliminary condition of the establishment of peace among Christian princes. After the Gospel for Sexagesima Sunday had been sung, the Envoys of Louis XII., Claude de Seyssel and Louis Forbin de Solier, presented their King's solemn declaration that he severed himself thenceforward from all connection with the Council of Pisa, and freely and plainly acknowledged the Council of the Lateran as the only one that was legitimate. Simultaneously a fresh deputation was announced, con-

mun et pessimum et barbarum crudum. Finito sermone orator regis Galli, qui adfuit orationi, surrexit et protestatus est alte satis quidem eleganter et bene de non admittenda obedientia ducis Mediolani, cum ipse non sit dux nec ad eum pertineat ducatus, etc. Ad quem ille dom. Hieronymus cum vellet replicare, nos magistri inhibuimus ac vocem repressimus, et subito papa respondit bene et eleganter ut semper et acceptavit obedientiam ducis, neve inter ambarum partium oratores esset aliqua verbalis aut postea realis rixa, dixit festiviter utrique, quando regis Galli oratores praestabunt obedientiam pro rege et si forte nominabunt eum ducem Mediolani, quod tunc e converso orator Mediolani protestetur similiter, sicut iste nunc fecit, et sic fuit finis. Rossiana Library, Vienna, and Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

* SANUTO, XVII., 414. Cf. *Lettres de Louis XII.*, IV, 213 *seq.*

sisting of six prelates and four doctors who had taken part in the assembly of Pisa, but who now repudiated the pseudo-Council, and asked for absolution. Finally there was handed in a request from the remainder of the absent French, for permission to defer their appearance. Without such a request nothing could be done in the matter of the Pragmatic Sanction. Even on this solemn occasion there was an exciting episode; for the representative of Maximilian Sforza protested against the French King calling himself Duke of Milan in his declaration. The Pope assured him that no trouble should arise from this. After this the Ambassadors of Brandenburg and Montferrat joined the Council.

After the promulgation of a dogmatic constitution of which mention will be made later, two important Bulls were read aloud. One related to the reformation of the Curia, and the other to the restoration of peace among the Christian princes, the formation of a Crusade, and the reconciliation of the heretical Bohemians. The Pope commanded that the *Te Deum* should be sung at the end of the session in thanksgiving for the adhesion that France had given to the Council, thereby restoring the unity of the Church.*

Thus did the first year of Leo X. close with a crowning success for his policy of peace. The schism which had

* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 85-97. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 579-589, and the * Letter which Francesco, the brother of Maximilian Sforza, wrote to the latter from Rome on the 19th of December, 1513. He says at the end: * *Fu reputato certamente uno dignissimo spectaculo vedere reducta una summa et intolerabile superbia ad una infinita humilita et summissione verso la Sede Apostolica, quale pero fu conosciuta et riputata da quelli hanno juditio ficta et simulata per necessita.* (State Archives, Milan.) See ROMANIN, VII., 271 *seq.*, for a French satire on the reconciliation of Louis XII., also, HÖFLER, *Die romanische Welt und ihr Verhältnis zu den Reformideen des Mittelalters*, Wien, 1878, 266.

broken out under Julius II. was practically healed, and the abjuration of many of the Pisa schismatics was to follow ere long.* This session of the Council of the Lateran was deeply interesting to the Romans; but their excitement was kept at fever heat by the series of splendid processions of Envoys sent to proffer their obedience to the Pope, which succeeded each other all through the first year of his pontificate, and half through the second.† Spectacles of this kind delighted the people quite as much as did the reduction of taxes, and all the other favours bestowed upon them by Leo X.‡ To the customary addresses of the Envoys the Pope replied with such elegance and readiness that the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, cannot refrain from repeating his expressions of admiration in his diary.§

* As to further particulars relating to the absolution of the Archbishops of Arles and Lyons, of Z. Ferreri, of Card. Briçonnet, of d'Albret and de Prie, and many other French ecclesiastics, see HEFFLEHERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 593, 614 *seq.* The date, which is omitted there, of the reconciliation of de Prie, is, according to the * Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library), April 24, 1514.

† Cf. Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 2 *seq.*, * Diary of a Frenchman, in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library). SANUTO, Diario, XVI., and TIZIO, * Hist. Senen., in Cod. G., II., 37 (Chigi Library, Rome).

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 35; SANUTO, XVI., 225; and BRANCA DE TELINI, * Diario in Cod. Barb., LIV., 22, f. 40b (Vatican Library).

§ 1513, June 20. The *obedientia* of the Sieneſe Ambassador: * Pontifex elegantissime atque argutissime respondit sic, ut omnes laudare non cessent eundem, qui ita in omnibus suis responsionibus se eleganter habuit, non sicut olim Julius qui quotiens orare volebat aut mori aut se mortuum esse fingeſat, praeter id quod saepe defecerit ita, ut mihi plerumque fuerit necesse adire et eum quasi exinanitum excitare et verba oblita rememorare. (Cf. 4th Germ. ed. of this work, Vol. III., 933.) 1513, Dec. 12, *Obedientia* of the Envoys from Montferrat: * Papa eis respondit elegantissime super omnium admirationem. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.*, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. SANUTO, XVI., 225.

The greatest sensation of all was caused by the embassy of King Emanuel of Portugal, who had already sent gifts to the Pope* with the intimation of his wondrous successes in the Indies and Africa.† On receipt of this the Pope ordered ecclesiastical commemorations, and encouraged the King, in a flattering letter, to take further action against the infidel.‡

Leo X. made extensive preparations for the reception of the Portuguese embassy, which rendered the spectacle of the 12th of March, 1514, unusually brilliant.§ A Bull had been published four days previously, which called on all the Portuguese to support the King in his crusade against the Moors of Africa. At the head of this embassy came Tristan d'Acunha, who was so well known for his voyages

* Cf. LANDUCCI, 343.

† Letter, dat. from Lisbon, 1513, June 6, in Cod. 1910, f. 140b-143b., Riccardi Library, Florence. Cf. UZIELLI, P. *Toscanelli e la circum navigazione dell' Africa (Nozze-Publ.)*, Florence, 1891.

‡ See RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 125 seq., 137, and the *Letter of Chieregati, dat. Rome, 1514, Jan. 8. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.) Cf. S. DE CIUTIIS, 13-15, and MACSWINEY, Portugal et le St. Siège, III., 94 seq., 114.

§ For details relating to the Embassy of King Emanuel to the Pope : it has been recently treated of by S. DE CIUTIIS (*Une ambassade Portugaise à Rome au 16me siècle*, Naples, 1889), and by MACSWINEY (Portugal, III., 102 seq.) : erroneously put by GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 182), in May, 1514. Cf. Paris de Grassis, **Diarium* (Secret Archives of the Vatican, esp. in RAYNALDUS, 1514, n. 1 seq. ; DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 161, and S. DE CIUTIIS, *loc. cit.*) ; SANUTO, XVII., 422, XVIII., 58 seq. ; JOVIUS, Hist., XII., 207, Elogia, 229 seqq., Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 234 seq., 238 seq. See also Diary in Mél. d'Arch., XXII., 277, the *Letter of Guido Postumo, dat. Rome, 1514, March 13 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and the contemporary *Chron., V. Polit., 50, f. 62 (Secret Archives of the Vatican) ; also FR. NOVELLUS, **Vita Leonis X.*, in Cod. Barb., lat. 2273, f. 11 (Vatican Library). About the gifts, cf. IOANNINENSIS, Penthatheucus, 99, LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 41.

of discovery. He was accompanied by two distinguished lawyers, Diego Pacheco and Juan de Faria, and by many members of the Portuguese nobility, as well as by a number of negroes and Indians—in all seventy persons.

The brilliant and peculiar procession caused even less sensation than the rare and precious gifts presented by the Envoy to the Pope, as a living proof of the conquest of the territory of the infidels. There were Persian horses, Indian poultry, parrots, a young panther, two leopards, and a white elephant, on which the sight-loving Romans could not sufficiently feast their eyes. A richly-dressed Moor rode on the powerful beast, which carried on its back, under an ornamental canopy, a chest, surmounted by a silver fortress flanked with many towers. Inside the chest were various gifts for Leo: vestments embroidered in gold and precious stones, monstrances and chalices of purest gold, a beautiful altar-cloth, and costly books. The elephant followed its leader docilely; and when it approached the bridge of St. Angelo, above which the Pope was stationed to behold the unwonted spectacle, the beast stood still, and bent its knees three times to His Holiness. The joy of the people reached its height when the elephant sprinkled them with water which had been given to it. The animal became the talk of the town; poets sang its praises,* and even the dry Master of Ceremonies set himself to describe it.

The clever beast, which performed various tricks, had for a keeper Battista Branconio, who was a friend of Raphael's. To no less a man than the great painter of Urbino was given the commission, after the elephant's solemn entry into Rome, to paint its portrait in a lower cupola of the Vatican. This portrait was destroyed in the

* *E.g.* B. F. Beroaldo, see PAQUIER, *Vita* 35, and Aurelius Serenus, in TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 287^b, 293, Chigi Library, Rome.

course of the restorations made by Paul V. But on a door which leads from the Stanza della Signatura into the Stanza d'Eliodoro, there has been preserved a fine piece of intarsia work, which represents the elephant as it is described by the poet Baraballo. In a woodcut also we have a representation of the beast, the like of which had never been seen in Rome since the days of the Emperors.*

On the 26th of March the Portuguese Envoy made his *obedientia* in a public Consistory. Pacheco delivered the usual discourse, which is a model of the extravagant bombast which was loved and admired at that time. Leo answered elegantly as well as exhaustively, treating of the necessity of peace among the Christian princes, and of their combination against the infidels.† Next day there took place the presentation of the gifts, the value of which

* The elephant of Leo X. boasts of no insignificant literature of its own, e.g. the Letter of Sadolet in ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., 197 *seq.*; OSORIUS, De reb. Eman. regis Lusit., IX., 263; Epist. obscur. vir., ed. Boecking, 262; TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 285*b seq.* (Chigi Library, Rome.) In this there is a contemporary woodcut representing the elephant. The death of the elephant (epitaph in REUMONT, III., 2, 857) was considered of sufficient importance to be mentioned by contemporaries: *Lundi, XVI., Juin 1516, mourut l'elephant; *Diary in Cod Barb., lat. 3552, f. 27. (Vatican Library.) Cf. SANUTO, XXII., 475; Spicil. Vat., I., 22; BURCKHARDT, II., 7, 290 *seq.*, V. ROSSI, in Intermezzo, Torino, 1890, 632 *seqq.*; CESARE in Nuova Rassegna, 1894, I., 133 *seq.* A memorial of the elephant, which has not been noticed before, is to be found at the Villa Madama. In the central niche of the terrace there is an elephant's head, from which there falls into an antique sarcophagus a jet of water from the hillside above.

† PARIS DE GRASSIS (*Diarium, XII., 24, Secret Archives of the Vatican) expressly mentions the 20th of March as the day of the *obedientia*. According to this the date of the letter of Bald. da Pescia (ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., II.) should be the 20th, and not the 25th of March. Cf. S. DE CIUTIIS, 32 *seq.*, where the discourse of the *obedientia* is again printed from ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 184 *seq.*

surpassed even the imagination of contemporary writers.* The Pope now determined to send to King Emanuel the Golden Rose which he had originally intended for the Emperor.†

The substantial concessions received by their Envoys were more important in the eyes of the Portuguese. Leo X. at once granted to the King power of raising a tenth from the Portuguese clergy, as long as the war in Africa lasted.‡ Moreover, by a Bull of June 7th, 1514, King Emanuel received the right of patronage over all bishoprics and benefices in his actual possessions over the sea, as well as in lands to be conquered by him in the future, and also the incorporation of these benefices in the Order of Christ.§ On the 3rd of November, this right of patronage in all countries conquered and to be conquered, was extended, not only to the whole Indies, but to all parts of the world as yet unknown.|| But even these marks of favour did not satisfy the generosity of Leo X.¶ In the following year he sent to King Emanuel the Sword and Hat

* The Franciscan, Fra Gratia de Francia, values the gifts at more than 80,000 ducats. *Cod. Urb., 1023, f. 340b, Vatican Library.

† PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.* *Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1514, March 26 and April 18, State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CVII., S. DE CIUTHIS, 62-63, in which the 26th of March should be read for the 26th of May, pages 30-32 relate to Leo's letter of thanks to King Emanuel of May 11, 1514; and 71-72 relate to the letter of the same day about the Golden Rose. See the detailed statement of MACSWINEY, III., 115 *seq.*

‡ Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 224-248; S. DE CIUTHIS, 65-70.

§ *Ibid.*, I., 254 *seq.*; DUMONT, II., I, 27. Cf. S. DE CIUTHIS, 70; SCHÄFER, Portugal, III., 83.

|| *Ibid.*, I. 275-298., Regest. Leonis X., n. 12516; MACSWINEY, III., 127.

¶ *Ibid.*, I., 304. See S. DE CIUTHIS, 71; SCHÄFER, Portugal, III., 84.

usually blessed by the Pope at Christmas.* In this way did the Supreme Head of the Church proclaim before the whole world the value he set on the war which the King of Portugal alone among Christian princes had been found to carry on against the infidel, by which such brilliant prospects were opened to Christendom.

* MACSWINEY, *Le Portugal et le Saint Siège*, I., 19 *seqq.*

CHAPTER II.

THE MEDICI AND THE POLICY OF LEO X., 1513-1515.

ALL Italians are warmly attached to their home and family. This characteristic, beautiful and noble in itself, but so harmful to many Popes, reached such proportions in Leo X. that, throughout his pontificate, the history of Florence and of the Medici was closely bound up with that of Rome.*

Two out of his many relatives, Giuliano, his brother, and Giulio his cousin, betook themselves to the Eternal City soon after the termination of the Conclave† The former, youngest son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, born in 1479, had always been intended for the secular state, as also was Lorenzo, the son of Leo's eldest brother Piero. As soon as these two arrived, on the 13th of September, 1513, the Roman patriciate was conferred on them with great pomp in the Capitol‡

Giuliano, with his weak health, did not seem to possess the qualifications necessary for the management of Florentine affairs; therefore Leo X. decided that he should remain in Rome, with the honourable title of General of the Church. The difficult task of governing the Florentine Republic fell, by command of the Pope, to the lot of Lorenzo, who, though only twenty-one years of age, repre-

* REUMONT-BASCHET, *Catherine de Médicis*, 8, 240.

† Cf. LANDUCCI, 339.

‡ SANUTO, XVII., 73. For more details, see Vol. VIII., chap. III. of this work.

sented the elder branch of the family. He returned to Florence from Rome on the 10th of August, 1513.*

The form of government in that city was in essentials exactly what it had been under Lorenzo the Magnificent. Two councils legislated for everything. One consisted of seventy members, elected for life, and the other of a hundred, who were changed every six months. The council of a hundred, to which all late Gonfalonieri might belong, had the sole right of levying supplies and imposing taxes. The adherents of the Medici were in a large majority in both councils, and it was therefore unnecessary to give to Lorenzo a special position above that of the other citizens. The eyes of all were turned on the palace of the Pope's nephew in the Via Larga, Giulio de' Medici having advised him to make friends by his courtesy and prudent hospitality.† The independence of Florence was a mere form, and the house of Medici practically governed supremely. Significant of this was the fact that in September, 1513, the Feast of SS. Cosmas and Damian, the patron saints of the Medici, was made into a state ho'day.‡ On the Feast of St. John, in 1514, Lorenzo

* Cf. LANDUCCI, 341.

† *Io son certo che la M. V. hormai debbe conoscere le conditioni et appetiti di codesti cittadini et io non per ricordare, ma per discorrere judico che due cose sieno ad proposito et costino poco et possino giovare assai, l'una qualche cerimonia exteriore di affabilità et gratitudine di parole de le quali ne sarei liberale con quelli ad chi più se convenghono et che ne son più desiderosi. L'altra di intratenere con buona electione quando uno et quando unaltro ad mangiare seco non solo ne la citta, ma in villa perche sono due termini che fanno gratia et ogni di più se ne acquista commendatione. Card. G de' Medici to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1514, Feb. 11. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CXIII.

‡ LANDUCCI, 342. Cf. M. Giorgi in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 52 *seq.*, and SANUTO, XXIV., 90 *seq.* Also LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova e Urbino, 222, n. 4. According to M. Giorgi the income of Florence amounted

celebrated with great pomp the anniversary of the return of his family to Florence, Cardinals Cibo, Este, Aragona, Cornaro, Bibbiena, and Sauli being present incognito. In May of the following year, the Pope's nephew having been elected Captain-General of the Florentine levies, he found himself in an unusually prominent position,* though the Florentine government was in all essentials dependent on Rome.†

The Pope's cousin, Giulio de' Medici, who had lived chiefly in Lombardy as an inmate of the Capuan Priory of St. John, was made Archbishop of Florence on the 9th of May, 1513. Public opinion considered Giulio, who was born on the 26th of May, 1478, after the murder of his father by the Pazzi, to be branded with the stain of illegitimate birth, and from this disability he had already received a dispensation.‡ When, in the autumn, there was a question of his being made Cardinal, it was attested by witnesses that a valid marriage had taken place secretly between his father and mother, Floreta, a special deed to that effect being drawn up;§ and, on the 23d of September, 1513, he was, at the age of thirty-five, raised

to 74,000 ducats, by the levy of taxes in town and country; 12,000 from the subject cities of Arezzo, Pisa, Pistoia, and Cortona; and, lastly, 160,000 from direct taxation. This tenth was called *balzello*.

* LANDUCCI, 346 *seq.*, 350; NARDI, 275; NERLI, VI., 126 *seq.*; ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 38 *seq.*; CAPPONI, III., 132 *seq.*; REUMONT, Toscana, I., 14 *seq.*; REUMONT-BASCHET, 244; PERRENS, III., 46 *seq.*; VERDI, 10-11, *cf.* LUZIO, Isabella d'Este, 41.

† ULMANN (Studien, II., 99 *seq.*) concludes from this that it was Lorenzo's independent ambition which made him find no satisfaction in the rôle of chief citizen of Florence, hampered from above and from below.

‡ Regest. Leonis X., n. 2514-2524.

§ Regest. Leonis X., n. 4598. *Cf.* JOVIUS, Pomp. Colonna, 151; NARDI, 274; Lit. Rundschau, 1884, 439.

to the much-coveted purple.* Giulio received as his title S. Maria in Domnica, which had been that of Leo X. before he was elected Pope.†

In this his first creation of Cardinals,‡ three others, closely connected with the new Pope, also received the red hat. These were Innocenzo Cibo, Lorenzo Pucci, and Bernardo Bibbiena.§ Innocenzo Cibo, born in 1491, was the eldest son of Franceschetto Cibo and Maddalena de' Medici, the sister of Leo X. Beyond this relationship he had no particular claims or merits. The Pope in nominating him is reported to have said, in reference to his own elevation through his grandfather: "What I re-

* Even on March 10, 1513, Giulio de' Medici had tried to interest the influential Piero di Antonio Pucci on behalf of his nomination. See the remarkable document published by G. O. CORAZZINI for *Nozze Ciampolini-Magagnini*, 1894, pp. 17-18.

† On Sept. 1, 1514, Card. de' Medici was appointed Legate at Bologna; Regest. Leonis X., n. 11300, and the *Brief to Bologna of the 1st of September, 1514, in the State Archives, Bologna. Cf. Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1513, Sept. 5; State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CVII.

‡ Cf. the *Letter of Carlo Agnello, Sept. 23, 1513 (Gonzaga Archives). *PARIS DE GRASSIS, see Appendix, No. 6. JOVIUS, Hist., XI., 191. BEMBI epist., V., 1 and 10; Regest. Leonis X. n. 4525; 4624. Miscell. d. Stor. Ital., II., 89 *seqq.*, 96, 102. CARDELLA, IV., 1 *seq.* PANVINIUS, 353. CIACONIUS, III., 337 *seqq.*

§ The publication followed in a Consistory held on Sept. 27, 1513, which PARIS DE GRASSIS *(Diarium) describes in detail. He says: *Illico papa inchoavit aperiens causas quibus motus erat ad creationem horum cardinalium, dans unicuique modestissimam laudem, et in veritate sermo papae praeter verba sanctissima etiam commodissima et elegantissima fuerunt. . . . Et egressi sunt omnes, cardinales autem antiqui duxerunt novos ad aedes novas proprias pontificis, in quibus ipse habitabat dum esset cardinalis. A banquet terminated the solemnity. On the Feast of St. Nicholas, Dec. 6, 1513, Paris writes thus: Papa dedit 4 minores ordines tribus cardinalibus (Cibo, Medici, and Bibbiena). Cf. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 9.

ceived from an Innocent, that do I give now to an Innocent." Certainly this did not justify the reception of a youth of twenty-two into the Senate of the Church. As, moreover, he made a very worldly use of his rich benefices, and gave himself over to a life of immorality, nothing but blame can be attached to his elevation to the purple.*

Lorenzo Pucci, whose beautiful features are reproduced in the portrait by the master-hand of Sebastiano del Piombo (now in the Hofmuseum at Vienna), was not only a member of one of the most respected branches of the Medici family, but had given proof of his ability and skill under the pontificate of Julius II. Besides this he had been for a long time teacher of law at Pisa, and had a profound knowledge of canon law and theology. Unfortunately, these excellent qualities were marred by the most execrable avarice, which he sought to satisfy by an unscrupulous traffic in the matter of indulgences.† It must, however, be admitted that when it was a question of the promotion of art, Pucci did not spare himself. As an instance of this may be cited the fact that he had his chapel in the Trinità de' Monti painted by Perino del Vaga.‡ He was also on terms of intimacy with Raphael, and it was through an arrangement made by him on behalf of his nephew Antonio that the picture of St. Cecilia was painted.§ Michael Angelo also did work for the Cardinal of the Quattro Coronati, by which name Pucci was known, after his titular church. If he could say, when speaking of that master, that he

* REUMONT, *Beitrag*, IV., 105, and STAFFETTI, *Il card. J. Cibo*, 25 *seqq.*, 33 *seqq.*

† SCHULTE, I., 137 *seqq.*, 242 *seq.*, 264. Cf. *Quellen und Forschungen*, VI., 377 *seq.* ROSSI, *Pasq.*, XLVII.; *Gior. de lett.*, XLII., 99. See further, Vol. VIII. of this work, Chapter II.

‡ VASARI, X., 149.

§ MÜNTZ, *Raphaël*, 545.

was true to him as a brother, such a relationship speaks for itself of the Cardinal's intellectual greatness.*

The third to be raised to the purple was, no doubt, a very distinguished and intellectual man; but he was so worldly-minded that his elevation also must be reprehended. Bernardo Dovizi, usually known as Bibbiena from the place of his birth, a small town in the upper Casentino, had been closely connected with the Medici from his early youth. In Florence he had superintended the studies of the young Giovanni, had then become his private secretary, had accompanied him into exile, had defended his interests with Julius II., and had, finally, been invaluable to him by his services as conclavist during the business of the election.† As a reward for these services he was first named chief treasurer, and soon after raised to the purple. He was not, however, fitted for such a dignity, being essentially a man of the world, who, besides being devoted to literary and artistic enjoyments, by no means despised those of a grosser description. He was much valued by Leo X. on account of his faithful services, his ready pen, his warm interest in literature and art, and his invariable gaiety and overflowing spirits. As an organizer of festivities he had no equal.‡ In political matters he was the Pope's principal and most influential adviser during the first years of Leo's pontificate. At that time, out of opposition to Giuliano, he took up a line against the French; and this was probably the cause of the great fluctuations in the Papal policy.

The political influence exercised by Bibbiena was illustrated by the alterations effected by Leo in the office

* DAELLI, Carte michelangioleschi inedite, 31.

† See *supra*, p. 24.

‡ BANDINI, Bibbiena, 16 *seqq.* For further details, see Vol. VIII of this work, Chapter II.

of the Papal secretaries.* Innocent VIII., in reorganizing this department, had placed at its head a confidential secretary, called indifferently *segretario domestico*, *secreto*, or *intimo*, who almost filled the place of a Secretary of State. He was given an apartment in the Vatican, and had free admission to the Pope at all hours; and to him alone were his master's secrets confided. To him were given over the reports of the Nuncios, to be answered in accordance with the verbal directions of the Pope. Naturally this extraordinary office became ere long the object of envy of the other secretaries, and led, moreover, to many abuses. In order to put an end to all complaints, Leo X. appointed special secretaries for the secret Briefs.†

The post of "segretario intimo" held under Leo X. by Pietro Ardinghello, was considerably reduced in importance by the fact that a Cardinal intervened between him and the Pope, and that all business passed through him.‡ At first this Cardinal was Bibbiena; later it was Giulio de' Medici. It is a mistake to say that at that time the latter was the right hand of the Pope; on the contrary, he had

* Cf. the important "Informatione del secretario et secretaria di N. Sr.," by G. Carga, in 1574, printed from Cod. Urb., 859, f. 72 (cf. 854, f. 29 *seqq.*) of the Vatican Library, in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 457 *seqq.* Unfortunately the text is often illegible through its errors. Thus p. 457, Z. 10, *pure* must be read for *per*; p. 459, 25, *declinato* for *diverso*; 29, *resta* for *vista*; p. 460, 13, *Amulio* for *Amalio*; 10, *servito* for *scritto*; p. 462, 7, *se si* for *scilicet*; p. 463, 16, *medesimo* for *moltissimi*; p. 464, 6, *scemata* for *stimata*; 18, *il secretorio* is missing after *cresciuta*; 22, *erunt* for *erant*; p. 465, 27, *espedizione* for *stimazione*. See also SICKEL, in Sitzungsber. der Wiener Ak. CXXXVIII., 40 *seq.*; RICHARD, Origines de la nonciature de France; ANCEL, in Rev. d. quest. hist. LXXIX., 409; LXXX., 113 *seq.*; *Privilegia et constitutiones secretarior. apost.* (1517, Maii 8), in Cod. Vat. 3749 f. 69-74, and with variations in Cod. Ottob. 492 f. 47-50.

† Sadolet and Bembo, see Informatione, *loc. cit.*, 464.

‡ Informatione, *loc. cit.*, 465

to resign himself for a long time to the Pope's carrying on the most important business independently of him with Cardinal Bibbiena.* The situation became more and more complicated. Bibbiena had been the confidential secretary of Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, and still retained the same post under the Pope during the first years of Leo's pontificate; even after he had been made a Cardinal, while, by reason of the dignity of the purple, he held a position incalculably superior to that held by Ardinghello, who was more of a private secretary to Leo, for a long time—certainly till the autumn of 1515—he played a part, through his favour with the Pope, far more important than did Cardinal Giulio. Not until 1516 or 1517 did the latter rise to being the principal adviser of the Pope.† Previously, Bibbiena's position had been so confidential that state secrets were confided to him alone, to the exclusion of even Cardinal Giulio.‡ “Bibbiena is all and everything,” declares a Venetian, immediately after the election.§ Even in the years 1514 and 1515 diplomatists called him the “alter ego” of the Pope.||

Bibbiena was a novice in the higher matters of diplomacy, and it was often difficult for him to feel his way. His position was made still more difficult by the

* This is shown by the important essay of RICHARD, 9 *seqq.*

† “Il Papa à consieri, so' nepote card. Medici, qual è homo da ben, homo di non molte facende, benchè adesso il manegio di la carte è in le so' man, che prima era in S. Maria di Portego, poi dito card. Bibbiena, qual è de la parte di Spagna,” says M. Giorgi in his final report of March 17, 1517, in SANUTO, XXIV., 90.

‡ See Manosc. Torrig., XIX., 222, 224, 225, 233, 239. Cf. RICHARD, 9 and 105, where it is expressly said that the diplomatic business was taken from Bibbiena and handed over to Card. Medici.

§ SANUTO, XVI., 54.

|| Also the “alter papa.” See CIAN in the Arch. Veneto, N.S., XXXI. (1886), 71.

intrigues of the friends and adherents of the Medici. These had come in crowds to Rome, where they played an important part. In Leo's signs of favour towards his relatives they saw only the beginning of much greater things. They entertained the most extravagant hopes, and confidently expected that both Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici would be at once made princes, and given independent territories to the north and south of the States of the Church. It seemed obvious to them that with such a change in Leo's position the dependents of the fortunate house should receive honourable and lucrative emoluments. It is important to establish the fact that these inordinate schemes for the exaltation of the house of Medici emanated neither from Leo nor from Giuliano or Lorenzo, but from the dependents of the family. Jacopo Nardi expressly states that it was the Medicean courtiers, when discussing matters in the Orsini palace soon after Leo's election, who set abroad the rumour that Giuliano was to be made King of Naples and Lorenzo Duke of Milan.* Plans of this sort might have led to the worst complications. The question was what line Leo would take about them.

Contemporaries are almost unanimous in declaring that Leo X. allowed himself to be influenced by family considerations in his political actions. But since then the opposite view has been taken, and maintained with success. Probably the truth lies between the two. There is no doubt that the policy of Leo X. was influenced more or less by family interests; but as far as we can form any judgment from the sources and materials that are at present at our command, private interests were not in reality so prominent in his mind as those of a higher and more general nature. Such was at one time the traditional policy of the Popes not to allow Naples and Milan to be

* NARDI, 276; NITTI, 18. Cf. ROCCA, B. Cerritanis Dialog., 46.

in the power of one and the same prince. Such also was the security and increase of the States of the Church. National interests also, such as were summed up in the cry for the "freedom for Italy," played no unimportant part in Leo's policy. Along with these there naturally ran an undercurrent of family interests.* Which of these various motives was the strongest in the mind of Leo X. cannot be decided with any certainty in the light of the materials which are at present available. In interpreting the secret processes of the human mind, the most extreme reserve is necessary.

As to such a policy of nepotism as was pursued by

* The reaction against the traditional conviction of the nepotism of Leo X., held by Ranke and Gregorovius, and reaching its culminating point in Baumgarten, in his work on Charles V., where he says: "Everything which the Pope did had for its principal object the worldly aggrandizement of this Lorenzo," originates with F. Nitti, a historian who admits that he has not the slightest sympathy with the great institution of which Leo X. was the head. The impression made by the proofs adduced by Nitti was all the greater because even Baumgarten was obliged to admit that he had laid too great a stress on the influence of family interests on the policy of Leo. X. (*Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1893, 14). Nitti has himself analysed the writings of a number of critics, especially Baumgarten, Cian, and De Leva (*Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XVI., 181 *seqq.*) But, however much I acknowledge the value of Nitti's work, I have accepted only within certain limitations the conclusions which are so very favourable to Leo X., for, as Giorgetti rightly maintains (in *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 5th Series, X., 416), in the questions here referred to there is to be seen a certain reserve. Some such reserve seems to be necessary, considering that a great part of the diplomatic correspondence of that time remains still unprinted. These extensive materials will be published by my honoured friend the Marchese A. Ferrajoli, who has been for some years collecting them with indefatigable diligence. The judgment formed by this eminent student of Leo's policy seems to be of exceptional value. Ferrajoli has put it into words in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XIX., 432. Though he rightly admits that Nitti exposes in a perfect manner the

Alexander VI., the same conditions were entirely wanting in the relatives of Leo X. This applies more immediately to Giuliano, and with certain reservations to Lorenzo de' Medici. Both these princes, famous for a time, live in the memory of the world in the idealized forms which the genius of Michael Angelo has given them in the statues on the tombs of the Medici.* But in reality they were not personalities of any importance. Giuliano, thirty-four years of age, was by nature kindly, gentle, and weak, somewhat melancholy and superstitious, but withal intellectual and refined. Like all the Medici, he was the friend of men of letters and artists. He was closely connected with Castiglione and Bembo.† Raphael painted his portrait, and his name is connected with Fra Giocondo and

“scopi papali ed europei” of Leo X., he shows that on the other hand he does not lay sufficient stress on either the family policy of the Pope, nor on his national ends which, according to Ferrajoli, are to be rated very highly. His conclusion is that, in spite of this reservation, Nitti's work is most important, and the most just of all that have been written about the political attitude of Leo X. Such an able man of research as J. Bernays (*Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXIV., 514 *seq.*) agrees in essentials with Nitti. One of the most eminent experts as regards the coming time, Ulmann, the biographer of Maximilian I., admits the efficiency of Nitti's researches, though he justly remarks that not all his statements and conclusions can be verified (*Studien zur Gesch.*, Leos X., 92 *seq.*). As against Nitti, Cian maintains emphatically the “nepotismo punto scrupoloso” of Leo X. (*Giorn. s. lett.*, XXI., 416 *seqq.*, and *Musa Medicea*, 10 and 49).

* These are not portraits, but ideal figures. While Giuliano is represented as a youth with an air of independence, Lorenzo is represented as an older and thoughtful man, hence known by the name of “il Penseroso.” From this H. Grimm has formed the hypothesis that the names of the princes have been changed. *Cf.* REUMONT in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1876, Beil., 216; MÜNTZ, *Hist. de l'Art*, III., 397 *seq.*; FESTER, Machiavelli, 93; and CIAN, *Musa Medicea*, 45.

† *Cf.* CIAN, *Musa Medicea*, 12 *seq.*, which first throws light on Giuliano's poetical work.

Leonardo da Vinci.* But Giuliano represented also the darker side of his family's characteristics, by his extravagant generosity, his boundless love of display, his desire for enjoyment, and his debauchery.† Licentiousness had exhausted his feeble body, and weakened his ambition and mental activity. A man to whom the granting of frequent audiences was too great an exertion, and who desired above all things to lead a quiet, undisturbed, and pleasant life, was not fitted for high political aspirations.‡

The young Lorenzo was quite different. Comely in person,§ a bold rider, an indefatigable sportsman, a good

* Giuliano's portrait at St. Petersburg (the Grand-Duchess Maria), of which there is a replica in the Uffizi, is considered to be the original work of the painter of Urbino. Cf. GRUYER, II., 214 *seq.*, Notice hist. sur un tableau de Raphaël représentant Julien de Médicis, Duc de Nemours, Paris, 1867. A second magnificent portrait of Giuliano is supposed to be by Botticelli. There are two replicas, one in the possession of Morelli in the Carrara Academy at Bergamo, the other in the Berlin Gallery. LERMOLIEFF (Galerie zu Berlin, Leipzig, 1893, 11 *seq.*) and LUZIO-RENIER (Mantova e Urbino, 220) consider the first, and BODE (Gemäldemuseen, Berlin, 1891, 32) the second, to be the original (de Lipart).

† Significant of this characteristic is the answer made by Lorenzo to his mother, Alfonsina, when she warned him against the pleasures of Carnival: *Io mi voglio dare piacere hora ch'io sono giovane et ch'io posso per haver un papa, etc. *Letter of Jan. 28, 1514. Minutario di lettere del Mag. Lorenzo de' Medici, Carte Stroz., III., State Archives, Florence.

‡ Cf. these characteristics in NITTI, 24 *seq.*, and FESTER, Machiavelli, 113. Many of his contemporaries over-estimated Giuliano's abilities. Cf. Piccolomini, Tizio, 126. As to Giuliano's love of display, cf. SANUTO, XX., 103, 110; IOANNINENSIS, Penth., 99, and the *List of the members of his court in Carte Stroz., X., 177 *seq.*, State Archives, Florence. See also CIAN, Musa Medicea, 10 and 48.

§ Raphael painted his portrait. Cf. GAYE, II., 146; REUMONT-BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 25; VERDI, 95; DELMATI, Il ritratto d. duca d'Urbino n. collez. d. conti Suardi ora Marenzi di Bergamo,

manager, though generous withal, a skilful diplomatist, he was considered by many of his contemporaries to be possessed of all the qualities which would enable him to play a great part as the nephew of the Pope. But more were necessary to obtain a crown, and of these Lorenzo possessed but few. His ambition, as far as we can judge, was moderate; a rich wife, a small, secure, productive estate, beyond these his aspirations did not at first soar. Further desires were not natural to him, but were fostered by the constant instigation of his mother, Alfonsina Orsini. That ambitious, highly-gifted woman burned with the desire to see a shining crown on the head of her son. She conceived lofty plans; at the most, Lorenzo agreed to them unwillingly.* Thus the project of gaining the principality of Piombino by supplanting the Appiani, undoubtedly emanated from Lorenzo's mother, and not from Lorenzo himself; though the plan came to nothing through the determined resistance of Leo X.†

Milano, 1891; MÜNTZ, Raphaël, 429, *cf.* 553; VENTURI, *Del ritratto di Lorenzo de' Medici*, dipinto da Raffaello, Modena, 1883.

* *Cf.* NITTI, 27 *seq.*, to whose criticisms Cian truly remarks (*Gior. d. lett. ital.*, XXI., 418) that, from a moral point of view, Lorenzo was not much better than Giuliano. Characteristic of this is the frivolous letter of Beatrice da Ferrara to Lorenzo, dat. Rome, 1517, April 23, *Carte Stroz.*, IX., 174 *seq.*, State Archives, Florence. For Lorenzo's antecedents, see GIORGETTI in the *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 4 Series, XI., 194 *seq.*, who agrees with Nitti as to the influence of Alfonsina Orsini; ULMANN, *Studien zur Gesch.*, Leos X., 99, which, by appealing to Vettori (328), pleads for a higher estimate of Lorenzo's character. Moreover, Ulmann recognises the merits of Nitti, and declares that we are not sufficiently informed to make a final judgment. VERDI also (115 *seq.*) places Lorenzo on a higher plane than does Nitti; whereas LUZIO-RENIER (*Mantova*, 219, 237-238), like myself, agree in essentials with Nitti. *Cf.* also the satire in *Gior. d. lett. ital.*, XLII., 103.

† *Cf.* GIORGETTI, *Lorenzo de' Medici e Jacopo V. d'Appiano*, *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 4 Series, VIII., 222-238. *Cf.* XI., 197.

Lorenzo returned reluctantly to Florence in August, 1513. He would much rather have taken up his abode permanently in Rome, which was so brilliant and rich in enjoyments.* But Leo was well acquainted with his nephew, in whom was to be seen the beginning of the decline of the Medici race. Having given the command of the Papal troops to Giuliano and that of the Florentines to Lorenzo, the Pope said to Giovanni da Poppi: "I have appointed two Captains who have next to no experience. Were some great enterprise to turn up, I know not how they would be able to carry it out!"† Both Giuliano and Lorenzo might have succumbed to the temptation of mixing themselves with the high-flown, extravagant projects of the Florentines; nevertheless, they lacked the moral and warlike qualities necessary for carrying them out.‡ It is therefore unsafe to allege from existing sources of information that the policy of Leo X. was based primarily on any such nepotistic projects. Nevertheless, the rumour that the crown of Naples was destined for Giuliano, spread further and further, till it reached the Court of Ferdinand of Spain. That King believed that the ambition of the Medici, in conjunction with France, was threatening his position in Italy.§

Leo hastened to make assurances that the rumour was without any foundation. Never, he asseverated, had such a plan existed. How could he be believed capable of making enemies at one and the same time of France, the Emperor, and Spain? A kingdom could not be taken

* NITTI (23) refers in this connection to the letters of Card. Giulio to Lorenzo in the autumn of 1513. State Archives, Florence.

† This interesting remark is to be found in a letter from Giovanni da Poppi, communicated by GIORGETTI, Arch. Stor. Ital., 4 Series, XI., 210-211.

‡ Cf. NITTI, Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVI., 193-194.

§ NITTI, 34.

possession of by words, and was it not his sole endeavour to restore universal peace, especially in Italy? * Ferdinand did not believe the assertions of the Pope; for both he and the Emperor had been filled with the deepest distrust of Leo ever since the ecclesiastical reconciliation of France. This distrust was justified so far that, from December, 1513, to July, 1514, the policy of the Pope seemed to be friendly to France.†

This must be looked at in connection with a change which was coming over the European situation. Louis XII., after his reconciliation with Rome, had made desperate efforts to win over Spain to his side. With this object, in December, 1513, while the war was in abeyance owing to the winter season and other circumstances, he made the most enticing offers to King Ferdinand. As the price of an alliance he offered the hand of his daughter Renée to either of Ferdinand's two grandsons, with Milan and Genoa, accompanied by the renunciation of all claims to Naples, as her marriage dowry.‡ Not one of these proposals was

* Letter of Giulio de' Medici, April 18, 1514, to Goro Ghersio, who had been sent to Switzerland with Filonardi in Nov. 1513. Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XIX., 66 *seq.*

† The two conflicting currents of Leo's policy in 1514, the one friendly to France and the other hostile, have been drawn up by CIAN in an interesting treatise (Arch. Veneto, XXX., 1885, 360 *seq.*) founded on documents in the State Archives, Venice, which among other things shews that these two currents bear the note in common of Leo's "politica lubrica anguilla che se contorce e sfugge talora allo mano che tenta afferrarla."

‡ See DUMONT, IV., 178 *seq.*, and BREWER, II., n. 144. An extract taken from the last mentioned work shews that there was no question of an agreement actually concluded, but only of a proposal. ULMANN (II., 484) admits this. RANKE (Rom. und Germ. Völker, 318) and Lanz allowed themselves to be deceived by the title in Dumont: *Traité et articles*, etc. As HUBER (III., 403) simply follows Lanz, without regard to Brewer, Uhlmann calls his statement scientifically useless.

ever carried out. On the other hand, a year's truce was concluded between Spain and France on the 13th of March, 1514.*

The news of this change in the aspect of affairs was a paralysing shock to the Pope. Every possible effort had to be made on his part to prevent either France or Spain from obtaining supremacy in Italy. By the proposed plan of marriage the prospect of Spanish supremacy rose up before him like a nightmare.† As an Italian as well as Pope, he felt himself to be most gravely menaced. As an Italian he was, like most of his fellow-countrymen, imbued with the determination that no power, whether foreign or other, should have such supremacy on the Italian peninsula as to destroy the balance of power, and injure what went by the name of the "freedom of Italy." As Pope, Leo adhered to what had been the traditional policy of Rome, namely, the guarding of the independence, both temporal and spiritual, of the Holy See. With this in view, he directed his efforts against any step which would lead to Naples and Milan being under the same sovereign.‡

But that the intention of making use of the rivalry between France and Spain to his own advantage had a place in influencing Leo's political attitude, can scarcely be disputed. Where injustice is done to the Medici Pope is in attributing everything he did to nepotism. The one predominant aim all through Leo's ever-changing policy—his care for the independence of the Church and Holy See, and the maintenance of the so-called freedom of Italy—is apparent to all. The confidential letters which were sent to the Papal Nuncios, show that Leo's chief reason for opposing the projected Franco-Spanish marriage lay in the

* DUMONT, IV., 1, 179 *seq.* Cf. LANZ, 142 *seq.*; ULMANN, II., 492 *seqq.*

† ZURITA, X., 84.

‡ NITTI, 35 *seqq.*

well-founded fear lest the power of Spain, being in possession of Naples, Milan, Genoa, and a portion of Venetian territory, should enslave the other Italian princes, the States of the Church, and even the Holy See itself.*

Fully aware of this danger, Leo X. overcame his natural irresolution and roused himself to take prompt and decisive measures.† The Papal diplomacy was in a state of feverish activity. The most urgent messages were sent to the representatives in France and Switzerland to try to put obstacles in the way of this very dangerous marriage project. On the 4th of March a letter was sent to the Swiss Nuncio, Goro Ghersio, stating that the decision of Louis XII. had reached Rome in the preceding night, to the effect that he had rather lose throne and life than renounce Milan; that this determination sprang from the marriage negotiations of France with Spain and the Emperor; that the Pope considered this projected marriage as the greatest of dangers; that as it had emanated originally from Louis' fear of the Swiss, the Pope hoped that the latter might lay down conditions somewhat less hard, so as to make peace with France possible, which, under all circumstances, would be better than the carrying out of this family alliance, which was a menace to all Europe.‡ The Florentine Ambassador, Roberto Acciaiuoli, was sent, so as to influence the King more directly. He

* See Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XIX., 56 *seq.* Cf. especially the Letter of March 5, 1514, to R. Acciaiuoli, and that of April 18 to Goro Ghersio (58-59, 66), to which NITTI (40 *seq.*) rightly attaches great importance. Nevertheless, there is an error in putting the letter to G. Ghersio on the 18th of June.

† NITTI, 41 *seq.*

‡ Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XIX., 56 *seq.* Cf. WIRZ, Filonardi, 24 *seq.*, for further particulars as to the imprudent conduct of the Papal Nuncio, G. Ghersio, who in the middle of June had to leave all further transactions to his colleague Filonardi.

was told to represent to Louis XII. that the marriage project was an act of desperation which must ruin France, if not at once, at any rate later.* The fear of Spanish supremacy now induced Leo to incline strongly towards France. As early as April, 1514, the Florentine Ambassador in Rome stated that the Pope, who had hitherto been unwilling even to grant an audience to the representative of Louis XII., now often transacted business with him. The same fear of Spain influenced his relations with the Swiss.† Later on, the animosity of the Pope, who believed himself to have been betrayed by Ferdinand, rose to a still higher point. Obviously this reacted on his relations with Maximilian.

This was experienced by Cardinal Lang, the representative of the Emperor, who was trying to effect a reconciliation between Maximilian and Venice. The negotiations dragged on for months. The Emperor's Envoy complained bitterly of the delays and hesitation caused by the indecision of the Pope, skilfully fostered by France. Nevertheless, he was quite ready to acknowledge the goodwill of the Pope. At last, on the 4th of March, a compromise was arrived at, although, thanks to the obstinacy of the Venetians, it was never carried out.‡ In other ways also, the mission of Lang was unproductive of peaceful results. The covetous and ambitious Cardinal, not content with the many emoluments which he had already secured,§

* Manosc. Torrig., ed Guasti, XIX., 58 *seq.*, 61 ; DESJARDINS, II., 600 *seq.*

† DESJARDINS, II., 613 *seq.* Cf. the Letter of Bald. da Pescia in ROSCOE-HENKE, 447 *seq.*

‡ Cf. ULMANN, II., 488 *seq.*, who says : "There is no evidence that the Pope, in any phase of the negotiations, delayed their conclusion by artifice." To the sources made use of by Ulmann, there must now be added the exhaustive accounts in SANUTO, XVII. and XVIII.

§ Cf. KALKOFF, Arch. f. Ref. Gesch., I., 387, n. 4.

now imperiously demanded the important as well as lucrative post of permanent Legate in Germany. The experiences of Rome, consequent on conferring a similar dignity on the French Cardinal, d'Amboise, did not conduce to the repetition of the experiment in Germany; for such permanent Legates depended more on their temporal sovereign than on the Pope. Moreover, the considerable reduction in the revenues of the Curia which would result from such a concession had to be weighed in the balance. As the Emperor himself urged his representative's request in a pressing letter, it seemed expedient to Leo not to refuse explicitly; and in a Consistory held on the 10th of May, he professed his willingness to grant the German legation to Lang for at any rate six months. But the Cardinals, instructed beforehand by the Pope as to the inexpediency of the concession, rejected even this compromise. Thereon Lang had one more farewell audience with Leo, in which he used "great words." On the 11th of May he travelled in a very bad humour to Loreto, where Bibbiena and Bembo* were staying at the time.†

* Concerning their mission, *cf.* the letter of Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1514, May 7 (State Archives, Florence, Av. il. princ., CVII.), and CIAN in Arch. Veneto, XXX., 1 (1885), 370.

† *Cf.* SANUTO, XVIII., 157, 175, 195 (here there is written "eri a dì 12 si parti," for the letter being dated 12 instead of 11, is due to a mistake; KALKOFF in Arch. Ref. Gesch., I., 387, was led by this into putting the date of the farewell audience on the 12th of May), 209-210; Letter of Bald. da Pescia, May 11, 1514, in ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 460 *seq.*; *Letter of Gabbioneta, dat. Rome, 1514, May 11, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library; TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 294, Chigi Library, Rome; and the *Report of Francesco Sforza to Duke Maximilian of Milan, dat. Rome, 1514, May 11: *Nel concistoro, qual si fece heri mattina se bene N. S. fece grandissima pratticha per reportare la legatione di Germania per el rev.^{mo} Gurbense saltem per sei mesi, tamen non si potè ottenere,

Louis XII. tried to foster Leo's favourable dispositions towards himself by assuring him that he would sacrifice life and property in defence of the Church.* The Nuncio, Ludovico di Canossa,† sent to France and England in May, on a mission which was at first kept strictly secret, might be sure of a very good reception.‡ His immediate task was the reconciliation of Louis XII. and Henry VIII.§ and thus to remove all necessity for the support of the Spanish claims by France.

The anti-Spanish feeling which was openly expressed in Rome is put before us in a very interesting report of the Venetian Envoy. According to this, Cardinal Lang tried to arrange a league between the Pope, Maximilian, and

perchè più volse la incircumspectione di molti che la rasone et auctoritate del pontefice, unde Sua S^{ria} R^{ma} heri tolse licentia da N. S^{re} et hogi ad bona hora è partita et ha tolto il camino di S. Maria di Loreto. State Archives, Milan.

* Despatch from Paris of Pandolfini, May 30, 1514, in DESJARDINS, II., 623; *cf.* 624.

† Canossa was named Master of the Household to the Pope in 1513, see SANUTO, XVI., 57. For further details about Canossa, see under Clement VII.

‡ Regest. Leonis X., n. 9230-9234; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 56 *seqq.*; PICOT (Les Italiens en France, Bordeaux, 1902), who errs in putting the first entrusting of the mission to Canossa at the end of 1513, and his arrival in Paris in April, 1514. Canossa's mission was certainly contemplated in the summer of 1513; but, according to SANUTO (XVIII., 236), he did not set out till the 20th of May, 1514, his credentials being made out for that month. His arrival in Paris took place in the beginning of June, see DESJARDINS, II., 624. Bald. da Pescia writes as follows to Lorenzo de' Medici concerning Canossa's mission: * Et non obstante che Bastiano di San Severino ritorni indietro et con commissione costui [Canossa] ha il secreto del cuore di S. S^{ta} et va per chiarire integramente ad quella M^{ta} il secreto suo et quello vuole delle cose di Italia. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ. CVII.

§ *Cf.* * Letter of Bald. da Pescia to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, 1514, May 30. State Archives, Florence, Av. il pr., CVII.

Ferdinand of Spain;* but it is self-evident that Leo X. would be opposed to any such plan. He trusted the fickle-minded Emperor, to whom he ascribed the intention of seizing the States of the Church, quite as little as he trusted the overbearing Aragonese.† The greatest exasperation against the Spaniards was felt by the Romans, who expressed the wish to drive "those barbarians" out of Italy. It is a fact that in May and June the Pope entered into secret negotiations with Venice hostile to Spain,‡ while all the time the secret treaty with France was being carried on. Of this last only those most in the Pope's confidence, Cardinals Medici and Bibbiena, as well as Giuliano de' Medici, knew anything. It was the general though vain expectation that a league between Leo X., France, Venice, Florence, and Ferrara would be proclaimed on the Feast of Corpus Christi, though a report was current in the city of the lagoons that France and the Pope had come to an understanding that Giuliano de' Medici was to receive the crown of Naples, and Louis XII. that of Milan. After this the Spaniards were to be driven out of Italy by the help of the Venetians.§

That Leo X. contemplated something of the kind is undoubted; but he remained undecided, and carried on negotiations on every side, without making up his mind. Observant onlookers had for some time been of the opinion that he would wait to see which side was likely to get the best of it. One thing, however, is certain, and that is that Leo did everything he possibly could to bring to naught

* SANUTO, XVIII., 210.

† *Ibid.*, 99. Cf. the remarkable utterance of Leo X. on the 14th of April, 1514, communicated by CIAN, *loc. cit.*, 373.

‡ *Ibid.*, 175 *seq.*, 182, 184, 236, 245, 246, 292.

§ *Ibid.*, 15, 250, 266, 272, 277, 301.

the Franco-Spanish marriage.* With this object in view, Ludovico di Canossa, one of the cleverest and most gifted diplomatists of the time, worked so effectually on both Louis XII. and Henry VIII. that he brought about not only a reconciliation but an alliance between them. The Anglo-French treaty was to be sealed by the marriage of the King of France, a widower since the beginning of the year, and Mary, the sister of the English King. The Papal Envoy was well supported by Henry's all-powerful minister, Wolsey, Archbishop of York, who aspired to the purple. On the 7th of August the Anglo-French alliance and the marriage contract were signed;† and in October the marriage of the elderly French King with the youthful Mary Tudor took place.

Leo X. was not to enjoy his diplomatic triumph for long. The danger of the Spanish supremacy had scarcely been removed when another terror, the French supremacy, arose in its place. The treaty of London contained, as Bembo remarks, a very dangerous clause which safeguarded the claims of Louis XII. to Milan, Asti, and Genoa. The reports of the Florentine Ambassador in Paris are full of fears lest Louis should now set forth on his expedition to conquer Italy. Consequently, the Pope retreated further and further from his friendship with France, and was inclined to form an alliance with the Emperor and Spain,

* SANUTO, XVIII., 210, 236.

† DUMONT, IV., 1, 183 *seq.*, 188 *seq.* Canossa had left Paris for England on the 8th of June, 1514. *Cf.* the Letter of Card. Giulio de' Medici of June 19, which contains instructions for the Nuncio (Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XIX., 73 *seq.*). *Cf.* DESJARDINS, II., 628 *seq.*, and "Louis XII. et l'alliance anglaise en 1514," Douai, 1866 (Extr. d. Mém. de la Soc. d'agricult. sciences et arts). The French in Rome made bonfires in honour of the alliance of their king with England; see * Diary of a Frenchman, Sept. 2, 1514, in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library.

while he sought to draw Venice over to his side by holding out a hope of obtaining for the Republic favourable terms of peace from Maximilian.*

Guicciardini, drawing from good sources, gives us a picture of the shifting relations and secret negotiations between Leo X. and France which took place in the year 1514, which shows us how much the Pope delighted in the two-faced diplomacy of the age. The well-known historian declares that Leo X. was set against the conquest of Milan by Louis XII., but that, on the other hand, he thought it expedient to restrain the King by the use of diplomatic arts alone. Through Cardinal Sanseverino, the Protector of France, he made the following suggestion to King Louis:—Seeing that the exigencies of the time did not allow of an open alliance between Rome and France, it would at anyrate be expedient to lay the foundations of a firm alliance in the future. A draft of this was sent to France; Louis XII. accepted the offer gratefully, but hesitated before closing with it. His brief hesitation decided Leo X. to listen to the proposals on the other side, and he concluded a treaty for one year with Spain and the Emperor, which mutually guaranteed the safety of their possessions. Scarcely had this arrangement been made before the answer of Louis XII. reached Rome, by which he agreed to all the Pope's proposals, with one proviso, namely, that as one of the clauses pledged him to defend Florence for Giuliano and Lorenzo, it was necessary that those two should be included in the negotiations. Thereupon Leo excused himself for having made his agreement with Spain and the Emperor on the plea that he had been forced to make it by Louis's delay in answering; except for this, there was nothing to prevent him from concluding

* Cf. CIAN in *Arch. Veneto*, XXX., 1 (1885), 383. Cf. NITTI, 43 *seq.* Florentine account in DESJARDINS, II., 639, 645, 646.

an alliance with France. Louis XII. considered it advisable to accept the excuses of the Pope. On this Leo X. and the French King signed a contract, with, however, the stipulation that this should not be done formally, and that the draft alone should be signed. In this way the most complete secrecy seemed to be assured.*

The alliance with England was of the greatest value to Louis, as he could now undisturbedly resume his plans for the conquest of Italy. The question was whether France would at once take the initiative or postpone the undertaking till another year. The latter course seemed the more probable, as there were no visible preparations for war. This being so, the Pope, who was still in his inmost heart as averse as ever from the thought of the conquest of Milan, thought it advisable not to oppose Louis openly. Soon he even went a step further, and expressly encouraged the King to carry out his plans. There can be no doubt that Leo X. did not act honourably in this. Guicciardini tries to explain his unusual conduct in the following way:— Either, he says, the Pope, being convinced that, with or without his consent, Louis XII. would attack Milan, wished to secure favourable terms in the event of the success of France, or else he knew that what the Emperor and Ferdinand maintained, but what Louis denied, namely, that in the interim of the truce the King of France was bound to refrain from hostilities, was an actual fact. The Pope therefore hoped that the French King would not at once accept the challenge and attack Milan. This hope was justified by the event, for the French King did put off his project till the following year, trusting to the assistance of the Pope, whom he tried to bind to his interests by the prospect of the conquest

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 2 ; LANZ, Einleitung, 152.

of Naples, either for the Church or for Giuliano de' Medici.*

There were many things which made Louis XII. distrust the Pope. In June the Emperor had quite secretly sold to Leo X. the Imperial fief of Modena, for 40,000 ducats; and in November this transaction was made known.† At once Louis XII. suspected a still closer alliance between the Pope and the Emperor. His suspicions increased when, in November, Leo X. demanded a conclusion of peace between the Christian powers, so that they might turn their arms against the Turks.‡ But what disconcerted the French King most was the fresh attempt of the Pope to reconcile Venice and the Emperor, thus threatening to deprive him of an important ally.§

The distrust of Louis XII. was well founded; for Leo X., and still more his trusted adviser Cardinal Bibbiena, were set against the conquest of Milan by the French. The most indubitable proof of this remained unknown to Louis XII., namely, a secret agreement, signed in Rome on the 21st of September, between Leo X. and Ferdinand of Spain. By this treaty both parties guaranteed the security of their Italian possessions during their lifetime, and explicitly pledged themselves to make no agreement with any other State, least of all with France, relating to the

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 2. Through Antonio Bibbiena, a nephew of the Cardinal, who knew many secrets, V. Lippomano learned in August that Leo, far from wishing to see the French in Italy, would secretly support the Emperor and Milan against him. SANUTO, XVIII., 438, *cf.*, for a corroboration of Guicciardini, XIX., 27.

† *Cf.* LANCELOTTI, *Cronaca*, I., 147 *seq.*; MURATORI, *Antichità Estensi*, II., 316; BALAN, V., 501-502; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 613.

‡ SANUTO, XVIII., 451; XIX., 210, 216 *seq.*, 223, 231 *seq.* DESJARDINS, II., 667-669, 670.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5.

reconquest of Milan, Genoa, and Asti, without the knowledge of the other.*

Even if Louis XII. knew nothing about this treaty, his distrust of Leo X. was fully justified by the other matters mentioned above, whatever protestations the Pope might make of his good-will towards France.† In order to frighten Leo, France entered into negotiations with Spain, which, however, failed in the desired effect, as was inevitable, considering the agreement already spoken of. At length the French King proffered to the Pope the formal request to give his support to the expedition against Milan, which was now decided on. The French agents laid before the Papal diplomatists the advantages—painted in the brightest colours—which the Church, the liberty of Italy, and the house of Medici would reap from a treaty between Leo X. and France. The Most Christian Kings had in all ages afforded the greatest services to the Holy See, whereas the Emperor and the King of Spain had no other object in view except to reduce the whole of Italy, including the Pope himself, to a state of servitude. But these representations did not make the desired impression on Leo X. At length, driven by this increasing pressure on the part of the French, he declared that the condition of affairs had changed, that a victory for France was very

* We learn of this agreement through BERGENROTH, II., n. 188, Archives of Simancas, where there is the original, signed by Card. Bibbiena, *de mandato S.D.N.* From the copy in the State Archives, Florence, NITTI has taken and published the full text of the important document (Arch. d. Soc. Rom. XVI., 208–210). See the Florentine copy mentioned in Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XXVI., 196 and 399, also 203 for the coexisting treaty of the Pope with Switzerland.

† Cf. the despatches of the Venetian Ambassador, Lando, on the 13th and 17th of November, 1514, in CIAN, Arch. Veneto, XXX., I, 387. Lando writes in the last-mentioned despatch: "Se el pontefice non è abarador le tutto inclinato al beneficio del Christianesimo."

doubtful, and could be bought only at the cost of much bloodshed. In face of the increasing danger from the Turks, he, as Pope, could not tolerate a war among Christian princes, and advised the King to defer his expedition.* Thus was a final decision put off by Leo; although there is no doubt that, at the end of November, he was very much set against the French.† But at that moment the time was approaching, which would necessitate a decision on the part of him, whose desire it was to preserve at all costs a free hand on every side.

It was with terror that the Medici Pope, like nearly all the other princes at that time, found himself "sailing to meet this crisis with two compasses."‡ We are assured that the Pope at that time passed many a sleepless night.§ In Rome the chances were being constantly weighed. Through Vettori, those associated with the Pope put questions to Machiavelli, the most acute politician of the age. It was his opinion that neutrality would be the Pope's worst policy, for it would hand him over to the will of the conqueror. As the victory of the French was almost a certainty, an alliance with Louis XII. was to be recommended. It was only in the event of Venice breaking away from France that a contrary policy was pointed out by Machiavelli.|| But just at that time the Signoria had declared to the Papal Envoy its adhesion to France, and

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 3. Cf. DESJARDINS, II., 674 *seq.*

† Cf. the Letter of Pietro Lando of Nov. 26, 1514, communicated by CIAN in Arch. Veneto, XXX., 1, 399-407. According to this, Leo X. urged Venice to unite at once with himself and the Emperor against France.

‡ This acute and pertinent simile was used by no less a writer than MURATORI, *Annali d'Italia* (ed. 2), XIV., 131. Cf. ULMANN, II., 501.

§ Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVI., 211.

|| Opere, Lettera, 38. Cf. VILLARI, Machiavelli, II. (Germ. ed.), 207 *seq.*; GASPARY-ROSSI, II., 2, 11, and 282.

had tried to draw Leo into the Franco-Venetian alliance, by putting before him a plan for the conquest of Naples to be given to Giuliano.*

While matters were still undecided in Rome, Louis XII. died,† being succeeded by Francis I., a man more gifted by nature than his predecessor. This young and ambitious prince was very much under the influence of his power-loving mother, Louisa of Savoy. Even in the lifetime of the late King, Louisa's sister, Filiberta, had been chosen as the bride of Giuliano, the Pope's brother. It was a purely political union, for Filiberta was neither young nor beautiful.‡ As her marriage portion Giuliano—who had been named Captain-General of the Church,§ on the 10th of January, 1515—was to receive Parma, Piacenza, and Reggio, as well as Modena. But both the Duke of Milan and the French King laid claim to Parma and Piacenza. The renunciation of his claim by either depended on the side taken by the Pope in the coming war; and the dilatory Pontiff was urged by both parties, by every means in their power, to come to a decision. Still more urgent was the necessity of a decision when the marriage between Giuliano and Filiberta became an accomplished fact on the 25th of June, 1515. But, however warmly Giuliano, who was always the friend of France, might recommend an open alliance with Francis I., the Pope still put off a

* NITTI, 49. As to Bembo's secret mission to Venice at the end of November, 1514, see SANUTO, XIX., 306, 308 *seq.*, 326 *seq.*; BEMBO, Opere, III., 478 *seq.*; ROMANIN, V., 296 *seq.*; LANZ, Einleitung, 152 *seq.*, and CIAN, *loc. cit.*

† Gabbioneta in his *Letter, dat. Rome, 1515, Jan. 12, tells us that the Pope rejoiced at the news. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ "Nec pulchra nec venusta." TIZIO (*Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 339, Chigi Library, Rome) says that she was about thirty years old. Cf. the description of her by Pasqualigo in SANUTO, XX., 22.

§ DESJARDINS, II., 689.

decision.* Not even his intimates were in a position to guess to which party he inclined.†

It was intended to form a great coalition between the Pope, the Emperor, the King of Spain, Milan, Genoa, and the Swiss, to prevent the reconquest of Milan by the French. A preliminary draft of this agreement was made out, which was to be ratified within two months, should the Swiss accept its terms.‡ This contract, which secured to the States of the Church Parma and Piacenza as well as Modena and Reggio, with the reservation of their rights of government, was made with the ulterior object of protecting Christendom against the Turks, but, primarily, with the view of protecting Italy against France's lust of conquest. Cardinal Bibbiena, who was its author, was quite convinced that the League would prove to be a powerful check on the French King. "It will be a lesson to Francis I.," he wrote to the Spanish Nuncio on the 5th of February 1515, "and will teach him to be moderate in this as well as in all other matters." §

Meanwhile great difficulties beset this skilfully-devised diplomatic scheme. The clause about Parma and Piacenza pleased neither the Duke of Milan nor the Swiss. Further obstacles were raised by the mistrust between Milan and

* Cf. the *cipher report of Carlo Agnello, dat. Rome, 1515, May the 6th, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. As to the marriage between Giuliano and Filiberta, see ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 80; BALAN, V., 502; and the monograph of A. ZOBİ, *Delle nozze del M. Giul. de Medici (Noss. Publ.)*, Firenze, 1868. As to the festal reception prepared in Rome for Giuliano and his wife, see the report of the Portuguese Embassy in Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 321, 325 *seq.* Cf. TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., *loc. cit.*, f. 335, Chigi Library, Rome.

† NITTI, 52.

‡ LANZ, *Mon. Habsburg. Aktenstücke und Briefe zur Gesch. Karls V.*, 2, 544 *seq.*, and *Einleitung*, 157 *seq.* Cf. RICHARD, 20-2.

§ The original in RICHARD, 22, n. 1.

Genoa, which finally led to the defection to France of the latter.* Nor could the terms of the League be pleasing to the Pope, seeing that the protection of Italy was to be effected by the preponderance of Spain and the Emperor. Nevertheless, it was clear to Leo X. that the League might do very good service by obtaining important concessions from France. He regulated his actions by this; he delayed the ratification of the terms, and, during the carrying on of the negotiations with Francis I., followed a waiting policy.†

These negotiations were being carried on by Ludovico di Canossa, who was still in France. An order reached that astute diplomatist at the end of March, bidding him offer the alliance of Rome to Francis I., on the condition that he would waive his claim on Naples. But the French King rejected the proposal in an abrupt and offensive manner.‡ In the Pope's condition he read his intention to secure the crown of Naples for his brother. Later historians also have interpreted Leo's policy at that time as actuated solely by ambition and nepotism. It is only the latest researches which have paved the way for a more just interpretation of his actions.§ That Leo X. would have gladly seen his brother on the throne of Naples

* For further details, see RICHARD'S interesting treatise, 24 *seq.*, 30 *seq.* Cf. LANZ, *Einleitung*, 164.

† LANZ, *Einleitung*, 159.

‡ See Canossa's reports to Card. Giulio de' Medici of the 9th and 23rd of April, 1515, in the *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, App. I., 306 *seq.*, and that of Aug. 20, 1515, ascribed by Nitti to Card. Medici (published in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XVI., 212); which, however, cannot be correct, as the Cardinal was not then in Rome. See RICHARD, 113. Cf. also BAUMGARTEN, *Politik Leos X.*, 526 *seq.*, and MADELIN, 13-14.

§ See the statement of NITTI (57 *seq.*), which I follow here. Cf. Nitti's analysis, with his criticism, in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XVI., 195 *seq.*, 201 *seq.*

cannot be doubted. But the terms of his proposed agreement with Francis I. did not proceed immediately from nepotistic considerations, being rather the result of the policy he had always followed. As the attack of the French could be no longer averted, and as there was much to be said in favour of its success, the Pope had no alternative but to do what he could to persuade France to give up her further designs on Naples, if he wished to prevent Milan and Naples being in the possession of the same power. The Pope's old fear of a union between the north and south of Italy was the real cause of the demand which he had made through Canossa from the new ruler of France.*

In spite of the rebuff received by Canossa, Leo X. renewed the same offer to Francis I. in June through the French Ambassador, Montmaur, though with no better result. The French King showed the same disinclination to consider the demands of the Pope relating to the independence of Genoa and the giving of Parma and Piacenza to Giuliano. Thereupon Leo X. began at once to make military preparations. But the French Ambassador declared that these did not frighten him at all, for his King could produce an overpowering force.† As regarded these boasts of the French, Bibbiena declared that such armies were no more difficult to raise than was the breath of rumour in respect to them.‡

The procuring of sufficient money for the expenses of the war presented most difficulty to the Pope. He now

* That the elevation of Giuliano to the crown of Naples was not the primary object of Leo X. is shewn by his project of giving the kingdom of Naples to the son of Frederick of Aragon. Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVI., 212.

† SANUTO, XX., 307, 341.

‡ Letter of the 25th of June, 1515; see RICHARD, 110.

realized the confused state of his financial accounts. Nevertheless, he promised to contribute 60,000 ducats monthly.* But further obstacles came from the want of unity and hair-splitting among those whom a common danger ought to have drawn together. The negotiations in the hands of the Swiss Nuncio, Filonardi, who was armed with full powers, prolonged themselves beyond all due bounds. It was only at the last moment that the ratification of the terms of the League, signed by the Swiss and Duke Maximilian, arrived in Rome.† But Leo X. even then still hesitated to give a final decision, and in spite of having armed his troops, his position remained ambiguous.‡ Consignments of money were constantly sent from Rome for the payment of the Spanish and Swiss soldiers, and there was no doubt in the mind of anybody that the Pope was ready to do anything to prevent the invasion of the French; yet the official confirmation and publication of the League in Rome was postponed in the most unaccountable manner. At the end of July the Venetian Ambassador asked His Holiness openly whether it were true, as was said in Rome, that he had given his signature to it. "It is true," replied Leo; "we have signed it, and Bulls and Briefs relating to our adhesion to the League are sealed. But before publishing them, we wish to await the answer of Francis I." §

This reply is highly characteristic of the Papal policy at that critical time. While the troops destined to oppose the French, who were on their way south, were paid chiefly with Roman money, the Pope up to the very last moment was contemplating a friendly arrangement with the

* SANUTO, XX., 400, 426.

† WIRZ, 28 *seq.*, 33 *seq.*; RICHARD, 44, 46.

‡ LANZ, Einleitung, 164-165; RICHARD, 111-112.

§ SANUTO, XX., 449-450.

enemy.* He did not give up hope even after the French had entered Italy. It was only the first blow, ineffective though it was, dealt by the young Duke of Guise, which at last compelled the Pope to act in concert with the Emperor and the Swiss.†

Giuliano de' Medici had been entrusted with the supreme command of the Papal troops as far back as the 29th of June, 1515. As, however, he fell seriously ill, Lorenzo de' Medici, the Captain of the Florentines, had to take his

* Cf. RICHARD, 112.

† NITTI (60) says that Leo X. joined the anti-French league definitely on the 14th of July, 1515; BROSC (I., 43) names the 15th, and BALAN, Boschetti (I., 90), the 17th of July. GISI (161) places the ratification as early as the beginning of July. One source gives none of the above dates. The Marchese Ferrajoli thinks it possible that the Pope joined before July, but in that case it must have been secretly (*sotoman spanol*, see SANUTO, XX., 427). On the 3rd of August the Venetian Ambassador wrote as follows: "Il Papa l'ha mandato i capitoli autentici sotoscritti *overa la copia, si ch'è si pol dir pubblicata*;" (he then enumerates the articles) "tamen il Papa dice non ha fatto ancora nulla." See SANUTO, XX., 470. According to the letter in *Manosc. Torig.*, XIX., 247, it is established on Aug. 6 that the Pope will oppose France, "non manifestamente sed con l'effecti." On Aug. 8 this decision was communicated to the Duke of Savoy. On the 15th the Venetian Ambassador reports that Bibbiena had confided to him: "ch'el Papa havia dato la bolla de la liga fata agli oratori yspani." In connection with this RICHARD (47, 3) remarks pertinently: J'incline à croire que Leon X. donna sa signature, mais nous n'en avons aucune preuve officielle, ni bulle ni bref. En réalité ce fut la nomination du comte de Guise et les incidents qui s'y attachent que décidèrent le pape à se ranger du côté de la ligue. As to the mission of the Count de Guise, who was only nineteen years old (!), see RICHARD, 113 *seq.* To the above sources there are to be added the reports of the Venetian Ambassador in SANUTO, XX., 471, 478, 508, 509, 510, 526. According to him Guise knew no Latin, and spoke only French; he came to Rome on the 2nd of August, and left with Montmaur on the 9th. There then remained at the Curia only the ordinary French agent, De Solier.

place on the 8th of August. Cardinal Giulio de' Medici was appointed Legate with the Papal troops.*

The Duke of Savoy, who was related to Leo X. as well as to Francis I., contemplated making a compromise, as the French had already crossed his frontier. He inquired through Giuliano as to the furthest concessions which the Pope would be ready to make. Giuliano explained in a secret instruction † that the price of his joining with France would be (1) the renunciation of the French claims on Parma and Piacenza; (2) the conclusion of a permanent peace between France and Spain, so that a general Christian League against the Turks might be brought about; (3) the renunciation of Naples in favour of the Holy See or of a third party agreeable to the Pope and King. Furthermore, he would agree that under no consideration the north

* Cf. SANUTO, XX., 362 *seq.*; Manosc. Torrig., XIX., 245, 247, 248, 249; Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 24; Regest. Leonis X., n. 16898; LANDUCCI, 350; VETTORI, 308; GIORGETTI in Arch. Stor. Ital., Series 4, XI., 212 *seq.* In the *Brief for the appointment of Laurent. Medices, reipubl. Florent. gentium armor. capit. general., dated Rome, the 8th of August, 1515, it says: "Sane cum dil^s filius nobilis vir Julianis Medices noster secundum carnem frater germanus ac gentium armor. ad nostra et dicte S.R.E. stipendia militantium capitaneus generalis suis nobis litteris significaverit, quod ipse ad suas gentes armor., quas ad Romandiole loca premiserat, ob nonnulla valetudinis sue incommoda . . ." could not go in person, and begged to have a substitute appointed . . . therefore we appoint you. Regest. secret., 1195, f. 253, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. the *original document of the same in Arch. di S. Angelo Arm., VIII., c. 2. Giulio de' Medici had left Rome for Florence on the 6th of July, and had gone thence to Bologna on the 16th of August. See SANUTO, XX., 375; LANDUCCI, 350-351. On July the 7th Leo X. ordered Simone Tornabuoni to move his troops towards Bologna. *Brief in Arm., XXXIX., tom. 31, No. 19, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Published in Manosc. Torrig., ed. Guasti, XXVI., 180. Its significance has been first made known by Nitti, 61 *seq.* Cf. CHIESI, n. 33.

and south of the Italian peninsula (*il capo e la coda d'Italia*) should be governed by one and the same sovereign, even were that one to be his own brother. This instruction affords a weighty proof that nepotistic designs were not what turned the balance in the position taken up by the Pope, but rather his care for the political and spiritual independence of the Holy See.

CHAPTER III.

THE CONQUEST OF MILAN BY THE FRENCH.—THE MEETING BETWEEN LEO X. AND FRANCIS I. AT BOLOGNA.

THE army which Francis I. concentrated at Lyons was one of the finest which any King of France had ever led into the field. It consisted of 35,000 men, 60 cannons, and 100 culverins. The most prominent among the generals were Trivulzio, Trémouille, Robert de la Marck, the leader of the formidable Black Company, Lautrec, and Bayard, nearly all of whom had had experience of the Italian theatre of war.* On the 27th of June the French King had renewed the alliance made by his predecessor with Venice, and Genoa had now also joined him.

It is obvious that the allies ought to have united against this force. But the Spanish Viceroy, Cardona, was kept on the Adige by the Venetians, while the Papal troops had no thought beyond that of covering Parma and Piacenza. Leo X. appealed to Francesco Maria, Duke of Urbino, to help him in the protection of those cities, but he, regardless of his fealty, favoured the French.† The Swiss, whose headquarters were at Susa, had occupied the passes so effectually that Francis I. considered it impossible to force

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 4; DIERAUER, II., 444 *seq.*; GISI, part 270, and SPONT., in *Rev. d. quest. hist.*, 1899, II., 66. French accounts exaggerate the strength of the army of Francis I., see TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.*, Cod. G., II., 37, f. 340, Chigi Library, Rome.

† Cf. BALAN, Boschetti, I., 91 *seq.*, and Chapter IV., *infra*.

them. By the advice of Trivulzio, who knew the country well, he chose for his passage across the Alps the Col d'Argentière, leading from Embrun to the valley of the Stura, which had been hitherto considered impassable. The undertaking was one of extraordinary difficulty, for rocks had to be blasted and bridges thrown over chasms; but the warlike zeal of Francis overcame all obstacles. The surprise of the enemy was complete. Prospero Colonna was taken prisoner with his corps of Milanese cavalry on the 12th of August, at Villa Franca, on the Po,* whereupon the Swiss, entirely baffled, retreated on Milan. This retreat cut off the communication between the various Swiss regiments, and destroyed the discipline of the troops. A spirit of disunion set in among the contingents from the different cantons.†

The unexpected success of the French, who were ere long completely possessed of the western part of the Duchy of Milan, not only broke down the confidence of the allies, but renewed their distrust of each other. That the Papal army was only half-hearted in the part it was playing is shown by the fact that it did not cross the Po. Leo X., who, after his long hesitation, had at last joined the anti-French League, more from fear than by choice,‡ was deeply moved by the unfortunate tidings which reached him from the theatre of war in Northern Italy. He had trusted to the military skill of Colonna as much as to the security of the watch kept by the Swiss in the Alpine passes § However much he might try to conceal his real feelings under bold words,

* *Cf.* the anonymous account sent to Lorenzo de' Medici, DESJARDINS, II., 706. *Cf.* VETTORI, 308.

† DIERAUER, II., 446 *seq.*

‡ VETTORI, 306.

§ *Cf.* the *Letter of July 30, 1515, "alli nunzii in Spagna," Nunziat. di Germania, I., 61. Secret Archives of the Vatican

the truth was that the destruction of his hopes made him lose courage completely, and he could see the French already occupying Rome, and spoke of flight to Gaeta or Ischia.*

The position in the Vatican was all the more painful because the news from the scene of war was so scanty and unreliable. "Write, write, write!" says Cardinal Bibbiena to Gambara in a letter of the 18th of August.† The position of Bibbiena, who was more of a humanist than a diplomatist, became more difficult each day. He found himself "as a tyro, making endless compromises between his dependence on the Medici, his care for the Church's interests, and hard political facts."‡ His letters afford a deep insight into the political machinery of the Curia.

On the 22nd of August the news of the loss of Alessandria reached Rome; for the Swiss had not occupied the town, although Leo X. had pointed out the importance of the place. He now himself specified the measures which the Cardinal-Legate, Giulio de' Medici, was to take. The first thing to be done was to see the complete reinstatement of the Bentivogli in Bologna, so as to keep a check on the Duke of Ferrara, who was longing to possess Modena and Reggio. At all costs Cardinal Giulio must cover those cities. In vain did Bibbiena seek to remonstrate against these measures. "Write as I have commanded you," was the answer of the Pope.§

A few days later Bibbiena had to intercede with his master for no less a personage than Giulio de' Medici. Every

* See the Letter of Ferdinand to H. de Vich in BERGENROTH, Henry VIII., II., n. 221; and SANUTO, XX., 550, 571. Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XII., 4.

† Archiv für schweiz. Gesch., XVI., 86.

‡ Histor. Zeitschr., XCIII., 164.

§ RICHARD, 120-122.

day made it more clear that the choice of that pusillanimous, irresolute man to be Cardinal-Legate with the army, had been most unfortunate. "The Cardinal," said Leo X., "writes about nothing but the dangers and difficulties which threaten him; as for the remedies which he holds in his hands, he does not know how to make use of them.* The defence of the absent Legate, which Bibbiena vainly attempted to make, was certainly inopportune, for it was through Cardinal Giulio's fault, as well as Lorenzo's, that the Papal army had advanced so slowly, and had then come altogether to a standstill. The letters exchanged between those two show this only too plainly. On the 27th of August, Giulio wrote to Lorenzo from Bologna, saying that if the Swiss, in spite of the enticing offers of Francis I., persisted in carrying on the war against the French, then he could do the same thing; but should this not be the case, neither could he venture to advance, and must await the development of events. Three days later Giulio repeated: "If Cardinal Schinner insists on sending forward his light cavalry, let him do so; but it will certainly be unaccompanied by the Papal colours.†

It was not extraordinary that Cardinal Giulio should act in this way, because his master, in spite of his energetic assertions, was at this time allowing negotiations to be entered on with the enemy.‡ At length the Pope fell back into a state of indecision even greater than usual. On the 27th of August he sent word to Lorenzo de' Medici, who wished to make peace on any terms with the French, that he must not give in so soon;§ but in the beginning of

* RICHARD, 124.

† See the text of this characteristic letter in DESJARDINS, II., 725 *seq.*, 729 *seq.*

‡ RICHARD, 123-124.

§ VERDI, 13; NITTI, 61.

September, he himself, under the influence of the bad news from the Swiss camp, determined to send the faithful Cintio da Tivoli secretly to Francis I. to excuse the attitude hitherto maintained by the Pope, and open negotiations with the French King. This precaution seemed to him necessary, in the not unlikely event of the fortune of war favouring the French arms still more.* A few days later Leo X. again yielded to renewed hopes of success and expressed his hope that Cintio would be detained by the Legate.†

Thus did Leo X. vacillate from one side to the other. One day he spoke with severity against France, and maintained his confidence in the valour of the Swiss, declaring that he would rather lose his mitre than Parma and Piacenza; but the next, he was inclining towards coming to an accommodation with Francis I., and even talked it over with Cardinal Sanseverino.‡ How great were the vacillations of the Pope can be seen by the fact that on the 2nd of September, 1515, he gave full powers to Duke Charles of Savoy and Ludovico di Canossa to treat with Francis I., but recalled these orders on the 13th of September.§

As a matter of fact, the Papal and Florentine troops were now inactive. In order to assure himself of safety in every event, Leo X. resolved to yield to the repeated requests of Henry VIII. and raise Wolsey to the purple. Many

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 4. Cf. RICHARD, 131. About Cintio, cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 2337 *seq.*, 3273, 3911.

† RICHARD, 131.

‡ SANUTO, XX., 574; XXI., 37, 52, 54 *seq.*

§ Manosc. Torrig., XXVI., 184. On September 8, 1515, Bald. de Pescia wrote to Lorenzo de' Medici from Rome saying that the Pope had been incensed against him (Lorenzo), but was now appeased: * "si che exhorto quanto so et posso V. Ex. al portarsi bene et esergli obediente che tutto il bene suo ha dependere da quella." State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CIX.

objections were made by members of the Sacred College; nevertheless, the Pope proceeded with the nomination in the Consistory held on the 10th of September, 1515.*

Meanwhile Cintio had been intercepted by the Spaniards. This, added to other circumstances, increased the mistrust between Spain and the Papal party. To add to the unsettled state of affairs, the Swiss now wavered, and were inclined to come to an accommodation with France, a treaty of peace being in fact made between the two countries on the 8th of September. However, a large portion of the Swiss army repudiated this agreement and marched on Milan,† where Cardinal Schinner was doing his utmost to stir up his fellow-countrymen to fight.

In the interval, Francis I. had approached the immediate neighbourhood of the capital of Lombardy, and pitched his camp at Marignano, which he fortified with the greatest skill. His position was attacked at noon on the 13th of September by 20,000 Swiss, incited by Cardinal Schinner. A desperate fight ensued, and it was only the darkness of night which put a temporary end to the bloodshed. In spite of the numerical superiority of the French, the Swiss had succeeded in driving the enemy from the outposts and capturing some colours and ordnance; but the battle remained undecided. Both armies passed the night on the field of battle, Francis I. sleeping on a gun-carriage. With the first glimpse of dawn the terrible struggle recommenced; and in spite of the heroism of the Swiss the

* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 18, with its completion in CREIGHTON, IV., 276-277 (*cf.* 206-207). *Cf.* DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 241; *Diary of a Frenchman in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 24, Vatican Library. See also SANUTO, XXI., 68, 74; Spicil. Vat., I., 210; Regest. Leonis X., n. 17764; ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 132; BROSCHE, VI., 73; MARTIN, 236.

† See DIERAUER, II., 447-449.

numerical superiority of the French won the day. The scale was turned by the arrival on the scene of a troop of Venetian horse, which the Swiss took to be the vanguard of the entire army of the Republic. Thousands of dead, mostly Swiss, covered the field of battle. The veteran Trivulzio declared that all the other eighteen battles in which he had fought were mere child's play to this tremendous struggle.*

On the 16th of September Leo received by a messenger despatched by Lorenzo, the joyful news that the Swiss had defeated the French. He at once sent word of this secretly to the Venetian Ambassador and to Cardinal Cornaro, forbidding them under pain of excommunication to spread the news. But when a second messenger arrived, repeating the intelligence, such precautions seemed unnecessary, and permission was given to publish the news. The French and Venetians living in Rome were half dead with alarm, whereas the Ambassadors of the Emperor and King of Spain, as well as the Swiss Guard, and, according to one source, even Cardinal Bibbiena himself, celebrated the victory by open rejoicings. Though Leo X. was delighted that the French should have been defeated, he knew how to restrain himself, and the Papal court took no part in the manifestations of joy.†

* Cf. DIERAUER, II., 451-455, where there is a good epitome of the many, partly contradictory, accounts of the battle, in which, however, Prato (343) is overlooked. See also ROSMINI, Trivulzio, I., 494 *seq.*; GISI, 185 *seq.*; MIGNET, Rivalité, I., 86 *seq.*; R. INGANNI, Origine e vicende della capella espiat. a Zivido, Milano, 1887; and DÄNDLIKER, Gesch. der Schweiz, II., 323 *seq.*, where there is also a plan of the field of battle; also SPONT. in Rev. de quest. hist., 1899, II., 69 *seq.* A poem on the battle in LILIENCROON, III., 170 and Nos. 292-294. Cf. Mém. de la Soc. d'Hist. de la Suisse rom., Series 2, IV.; and FLAMINI, Studi di Storia lett. (1895), 227 *seq.* Cf. CLERIC, in Der Schweiz. Monatschrift für Offiziere, 1905.

† Report of M. Giorgi in SANUTO, XXI., 115, and also in ALBÈRI,

How prudently the Pope had acted was soon seen; for next morning he received the news that the second day of the battle had resulted in a victory for the French—news which the enemies of France declared to be either invented or grossly exaggerated. The Venetian Ambassador received the welcome news quite early in the morning of the 6th of September, and once more breathed freely. He put on his robes of state and went at once to the Vatican. There he was informed by the private chamberlain, Serapica, that the Pope was still in bed. "His Holiness must be aroused," said Marino Giorgi. "That cannot be," replied Serapica. "I insist on speaking to His Holiness," returned the Ambassador. Only then was an audience obtained with the Pope, who had not time to finish his toilet. "Holy Father," said Giorgi ironically, "after the example of Christ, I will return you good for evil. Yesterday Your Holiness gave me bad and at the same time false news; to-day I bring in exchange good news which is also true: the Swiss have been defeated." "We also have received this news," replied Leo X.; "but the defeat has been inconsiderable." "Your Holiness can see the truth by this despatch," was the response of the Ambassador, as he handed to the Pope his own official letter, together with that of the Venetian representative with the French King. This last letter, the writer of which was known personally to the Pope, convinced His Holiness of the real state of things. Full of alarm, he cried out: "What is to become of us? What, furthermore, will become of you?" Marino tried to calm him by assuring him that no bad results could follow

II., 3, 43; and SANUTO, XXIV., 85 *seqq.* Cf. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 3. It is worthy of notice that neither the contemporary Diary of a Frenchman in the Barberini Library (see Mél. d'arch., XXII., 280 *seq.*) nor the *Diary of the Dutchman Cornelius de Fine (National Library, Paris) says anything about Bibbiena's celebrations of the victory.

for the Holy See. He then took his leave in order to inform Cardinals Bibbiena, Grimani, and Cornaro of what had occurred. Although the Venetians refrained from any external manifestations of their joy, the Swiss Guards were so incensed that Marino Giorgi thought it wise to keep away from the Vatican for a couple of days. At his next audience with Leo X. the Pope thus expressed himself: "We will throw ourselves into the arms of the Most Christian King, and beg his mercy." The Ambassador replied: "Most Holy Father, if you do so it will be neither to your detriment nor to that of the Holy See. The King is a true son of the Church."*

The union of the Pope with the victorious French King was to be effected more quickly and completely than the Venetians cared for. It is true that for one moment Leo seemed inclined to try the fortune of war once more in conjunction with the Emperor, Spain, and the Swiss;† but he very soon saw the hopelessness of any such attempt. Immediately after their defeat, the Swiss had abandoned Lombardy, leaving garrisons only in the fortresses of Milan and Cremona. It was therefore to be expected that Spain also would relinquish the struggle, and that the whole burden of hostilities would fall on the Pope. If Leo X. anticipated the very worst, his was far from being an empty fear; for Francis I. was making preparations to cross the Po at Pavia, and to occupy Parma and Piacenza as belonging to the Duchy of Milan. Were the

* SANUTO, XXI., 123, 135; and ALBÈRI, II., 3, 43-45. A private letter from Camillo Orsini, dat. ⁷/₁₅ Piacenza, 1515, Sept. 17 (SANUTO, XXI., 136), must have removed the last remaining doubt in Rome as to the complete victory of the French.

† RICHARD, 137, regards "ce dernier effort de politique belliqueuse" as a "manœuvre de diplomatie, et le pape n'avait d'autre objectif que de masquer sa retraite."

Pope to resist him any further, he was prepared to seize Modena and drive the Medici out of Florence.*

All idea of resistance vanished before such a danger. This was the conclusion arrived at by the immediate entourage of the Pope, especially by Alfonsina Orsini, who remembered but too well the eighteen years of exile which she owed to the obstinacy of Piero. "Bibbiena," she wrote in a state of great excitement, "will by his doings ruin us for the second time."† Roberto Acciaiuoli, the Florentine Ambassador in Rome, and Marino Giorgi worked in the same direction, exaggerating the actual danger. The Florentines implored the Pope to come to an agreement with France before the Swiss had made peace with her, or the Spaniards had accomplished their retreat. Lorenzo was quite ready to make peace on his own account, and had told Canossa, the Nuncio at the French court, that such was the Pope's desire.‡

Francis I., on his side, was equally disinclined to a war with the Pope—so much so that as early as the 18th of September he had told Lorenzo de' Medici that he had delegated an Envoy to take proposals of peace to Leo X.§ At one time the French had feared, and not without cause,

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5. The slight resistance which Modena, owing to the weak condition of her walls, could have offered to an attack, is shown by the *Letter of Annibale Rangoni to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Modena, 1515, Sept. 3. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CIX.

† Letter of Sept. 22, 1515, to Lorenzo de' Medici, in Arch. stor. Ital., Series 5, VIII., 189. Cf. NITTI, 67. Jacopo Salviati also was quite in favour of peace with France; see the *Letter of Fil. Strozzi to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Florence, 1515, Sept. 26. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CVIII.

‡ MADELIN, 20.

§ Francis I. to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. 1515, Sept. 18, quoted by MADELIN, 33.

that a coalition between the Emperor, Henry VIII., and the Swiss might wrest from him the fruits of his victory. Besides, he and all the French remembered only too well the great danger in which his predecessor had been involved by his contest with the Holy See. Therefore the Duke of Savoy, who had been entrusted by the Pope with his proposals of peace, found a favourable reception with his royal uncle.* Leo X. had to make up his mind to a complete change in his policy, and how difficult he found this is shown by the excited debates held in the Vatican.† In smoothing the difficulties which came in the way of an arrangement, no one worked harder than Ludovico di Canossa, who came with all speed to Rome from the King's camp. Canossa, who arrived in the Eternal City on the 25th of September, brought with him fourteen articles of a treaty to be agreed to; and in these the Venetian Ambassador saw to his dismay that the interests of his Republic were totally disregarded.‡ By a thorough examination of all objections Canossa succeeded in overcoming the last hesitations of the Pope, who, however, would have gladly awaited the result of a Diet assembled by the Swiss at Zurich. The Envoy pointed out the danger of delay, lest Francis I., encouraged by his own generals and those of the Venetians, might be induced to take further measures, such even as an attack on Florence. He showed, moreover, that nothing was to be hoped for from the Swiss, as indeed was proved to be the case by future events.§ The Pope, who yielded mainly on account of the menace to the States of the Church and

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5; VETTORI, 313. Cf. CREIGHTON, IV., 213.

† Cf. RICHARD, 140 *seq.*

‡ SANUTO, XXI., 153, *cf.* 146.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5.

to his supremacy in Florence,* made a stand on certain points, and insisted on certain conditions in favour of his native city. He stipulated that he should be spared a direct surrender of Parma and Piacenza; though on the other hand he was willing to recall his officials from them. Finally, the withdrawal of the Papal troops was to take place at a convenient opportunity, out of consideration for the Emperor.†

On the 27th of September, Leo X. sent urgent letters to the French King and his Chancellor, Du Prat, in which he reiterated his desire for peace.‡ The decision of the Pope was awaited with feverish anxiety, especially in Florence.§ When the terms of the agreement between Rome and France were made known, the enemies of the French King fell into a state of great excitement. Even his allies, the Venetians, feared that their interests had not been sufficiently considered in the treaty.||

But the announcement of a complete agreement was premature; for there were several important points about which an understanding could not be arrived at at once,¶

* Cf. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 3. Leo X., according to the representative of the Duchess of Bari, on Oct. 1, 1515, did not wish, "per non patire scorno de Fiorenza," that his Florentines "con lo favore di Franza li tagliassero el naso essendo papa." Spicil. Vatic. I., 524.

† GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5; VETTORI, 314.

‡ BEMBI, Epist., XI., 1, 2; cf. X., 61. FABRONIUS, 279.

§ *Stiamo qui in grandissima suspensione di animo se el papa ratificherà li capitoli porta Tricarico o pure starà duro in volere altri ricompensi di Parma e Piacenza, wrote Fil. Strozzi from Florence to Lorenzo de' Medici on Sept. 26, 1515. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CVIII.

|| SANUTO, XXI., 206; MADELIN, 34 *seq.*

¶ Canossa wrote as follows on Sept. 28, 1515, to the Grand Master Arthur Gouffier de Boissy, concerning the Pope: *Non è hora interamente resoluta dico circa la particularitate de capitoli, ben si risolve S. S^{ta} di voler abrazar el S^{to} Re per bon figliolo et corere una

and on account of these Canossa returned to the King on the 31st of September.* Francis' demand for the renunciation of all claims on Parma and Piacenza was the severest blow to the Pope; though before long, by the purchase of Modena, that territory was once more united to the States of the Church. But the development of events in Lombardy was so entirely in favour of the French, that Leo had to resign himself to the payment of a high price. At the beginning of October Maximilian Sforza gave up all for lost, and surrendered, not only the fortresses of Milan and Cremona, but, for the sake of one year's assured tenure, renounced all further claims on the Duchy. On the 11th of October Francis I. made his triumphal entry into the capital of Lombardy.†

Leo X., who had left Rome on the 1st of October, 1515, and had retired to Viterbo, under the pretext of taking an autumn holiday,‡ approved, on the 13th of the same month, of the conclusion of preliminary articles of peace. The conditions were as follows: Francis was to keep Parma and Piacenza, which were to be once more united to Milan;

medesima fortuna con S. M^{ta} Particol., 153, n. 97. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

* SANUTO, XXI., 201. On Sept. 30, Leo wrote from Rome to Ant. Du Prat: “*Intelleximus a ven. fratre episcopo Tricaricensi nuntio nostro quanto cum studio huius s. apost. sedis res atque nostras apud cariss. in Christo filium nostrum Franciscum Francorum regem christianiss., iuveris quantamque in nos eandemque sedem observantiam et reverentiam ostenderis.” He praises him for this, and recommends to him Canossa, who was returning to Francis I. Orig. in the National Archives in Paris, L. 357. The copy of this brief in BEMBI, Epist., XI., 2, does not agree with the original.

† PRATO, 347; GRUMELLO, 207; GUICCIARDINI, XII., 5; SANUTO, XXI., 233, 236 *seq.* Cf. Arch. stor. Lomb., XVII., 416 *seq.*

‡ Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 24; *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 24. Vatican Library.

but on the other hand he pledged himself to pay for the salt from the salt-mines of Cervia, whereby the Apostolic Exchequer was assured of a considerable income. The French King, moreover, guaranteed the authority of Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici in Florence, and promised to make no treaty with any vassal of the Church without the knowledge of the Pope. Both contracting parties gave mutual security for their possessions.* On the 14th of October the Pope entrusted the learned Giano Lascaris, a man high in the favour of the French King, with a mission to the victor of Marignano.† But the deed of ratification was taken to Francis by Lorenzo de' Medici in person. He arrived in Milan on the 18th, where an honourable reception awaited him. Henceforward he placed his future hopes more than ever on the French King.‡

The news spread about among the members of the Curia, that Francis I. intended to visit Rome, perhaps with his whole army.§ That at the same time his eyes would be turned towards Naples, seemed to them to be more than probable. But the fact was that Francis I. was most desirous of a personal interview with the Pope. Although the Venetians warned him to be on his guard, as neither Leo nor Bibbiena would shrink from anything to gain their own ends,|| the King persisted in his intention; for he hoped to be able to gain further concessions by word of

* DUMONT, IV., 1, 214-215. Cf. RICHARD, 142; ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 258, n. The original minutes of the *Bull "*Inter caetera sollicitudinis*," dated Viterbo, 1515, Oct. 13, by which Leo X. ratified the peace, are in the State Archives, Florence.

† The original brief to Lascari, dat. Viterbo, 1515, Oct. 14, in DELISLE, Cabinet des Ms., I., 151, n. 1.

‡ VERDI, 19. Cf. REUMONT-BASCHET, 246.

§ Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 24.

|| Cf. LAMANSKY, 45, 46.

mouth. Moreover, by obtaining a meeting with the Supreme Head of the Church, he hoped to make an impression on the enemies* who were gathering around him.†

Leo X. thought it necessary to fall in with the King's wishes; still, the one thing which he wished to avoid was a visit of Francis to Rome. He therefore proposed either Florence or Bologna as the place of meeting. As he was suffering much from his fistula, the Pope would have preferred to travel no further than Florence; but against this advantage, was to be placed the fear lest the enemies of the Medici in Florence might fraternize with the French King. Cardinal Giulio de' Medici and Lorenzo laid such stress on this danger, that Leo X. decided in favour of Bologna, this choice being pleasing to Francis for several reasons.‡ It was in vain that objections were raised, especially by Spain, and by Cardinal Adriano Castellesi, who had the Imperial interests warmly at heart, as well as by other members of the Sacred College.§ But the Pope was, in fact, more prudent than his advisers. No doubt the latter attached too much importance to appearances, thinking it derogatory to the dignity of the Pope that he should go so far afield to meet the French King.||

* JOVIUS, Hist., XV. (ed. 1550, I., 252).

† On Oct. 19, 1515, Henry VIII. and Ferdinand of Spain concluded a defensive alliance (DUMONT, IV., 1, 214 *seq.*). At once Pace, the English Envoy, began to raise a Swiss mercenary force.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; SANUTO, XXI., 273; NITTI, 72; MADELIN, 72; VERDI, 17-18; DESJARDINS, II., 740, 744. Lorenzo's mother Alfonsina worked hard in favour of the choice of Florence. Arch. Stor. Ital., Series 5, VIII., 189.

§ Cf. BREWER, II., 1216, 1282-1284, DESJARDINS, II., 740; BERGENROTH, II., n. 240; GEBHARDT, Adrian von Corneto, 36; MADELIN, 49.

|| Cf. Giorgi in SANUTO, XXIV., 86; Paris de Grassis in GREGOR-

On the 3rd of October a meeting of Cardinals was called at Viterbo,* where also Bonnavet arrived as Envoy from Francis I. on the 2nd of November.† Fourteen Cardinals arrived in obedience to the summons; and, in a Consistory held on the 5th of November, they gave their consent to the Pope's expedition to Bologna, which was to be made via Siena and Florence.‡ As Leo X. did not wish to return to Rome till Palm Sunday in the following year, the next session of the Lateran Council was postponed till the fifteenth day after Easter. The Florentine Cardinal, Soderini, was appointed Legate in Rome.§ The Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, was commissioned to arrange for the suite of the Pope, in conjunction with Cardinals Accolti and Pucci;|| Cardinal Sanseverino was sent to the King.¶

OVIUS, VIII., 191, A. 3; and Carpesanus in MARTÈNE-DURAND, V., 1306. Also TIZIO (*Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 39, f. 30, Chigi Library, Rome) says that Leo X. went to Bologna "cum ecclesiae ac sedis apost. de-decore."

* See the Brief in FABRONIUS, 93. Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 25; and BEMBI, Epist. XI., 9.

† Bonnavet had left Milan on Oct. 18. DESJARDINS, II., 742. His arrival at Viterbo is described by PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Secret Archives of the Vatican. See Appendix, No. 9.

‡ Cf. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Secret Archives of the Vatican, in Appendix, 10.

§ Soderini arrived in Rome on Nov. 9; see *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 24, Vatican Library. CORNELIUS DE FINE, in his *Diary (National Library, Paris), praises Soderini for his ability in governing, and his other good qualities.

|| PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.* See there, about the Pope's journey, who for the first time departed from the ancient custom of being preceded by the Blessed Sacrament (see PAGI, Brev., IV., 224). Cf. SANUTO, XXI., 375 *seq.* For the reception at Arezzo, see *Ricordi di Storia Aretina, I., 162 *seq.*, in the Library of the Fraternità di S. Maria at Arezzo.

¶ SANUTO, XXI., 274.

VOL. VII.

At Bolsena Leo X., who had shortly before been instrumental in making peace between Perugia and Assisi,* gave up his first idea of travelling to Florence via Siena, because of disturbances in the last-named city. Instead of this he chose another route, which would take him to Cortona by Orvieto and Castiglione.† At Cortona he remained for three days, being the guest of one of the members of his court, Giulio Passerini, and received a deputation of Florentines sent to welcome him; then, passing through Arezzo, the Pope arrived at Marignolle, the villa of Jacopo Gianfigliuzzi in the neighbourhood of Florence, and there he remained from the 27th till the 30th of November.‡

Meanwhile great preparations were being made in Florence for the reception of the distinguished guest. The Florentines did everything in their power to prepare a pageant as imposing as had been that in the Eternal City on the occasion of the "Possesso." The most celebrated artists of the day, Jacopo Sansovino, Antonio di Sangallo, Baccio Bandinelli, Andrea del Sarto, Pontorno, Perino del Vaga, Granacci, vied with one another in the contrivance of decorations which displayed a glorious combination of architecture, sculpture, and painting. Twelve

* See the *Briefs to Perugia, dated from Montefalisco, 1515, Oct. 17, and from Corneto, Oct. 22, in the Communal Library, Perugia.

† From Cortona Leo X. wrote as follows to the French King: *Ex dil. fil. Baltassar Stuerdo praeposito Clavasii familiari et cubiculario nostro litteras M^{ris}. tuae Christ^{mae}. tum consortis ac Aloisiae matris in Gallia regentis simul recepimus quae ipsae litterae et quae cum litteris Baltassar nobis exposuit gratissima et iucundissima fuere atque hoc unum potissimum quia ex pace inter nos inita non solum mater et coniux praedictae verum et, ut idem Baltassar testatur, universa Gallia tantam laetitiam ostenderunt ut nihil supra dici possit. Orig. L 357, National Archives, Paris.

‡ Cf. MORENI, *Notizie st. dei Contorni di Firenze*, IV., 132, and ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 135.

triumphal arches, richly ornamented with sculptures and paintings, were erected, and on these, to the admiration of all beholders, were to be seen reproductions of the most famous specimens of the architecture of ancient Rome, as well as colossal statues, while allegorical paintings and flattering inscriptions conveyed the praises of the first Florentine Pope. Jacopo Sansovino and Andrea del Sarto had erected a wooden façade to the Duomo, in close imitation of marble, covered with statues and bas-reliefs, while on the smooth surface of the façade Andrea del Sarto had painted pictures in *chiaroscuro*.

The Pope was greeted by music as he entered by the Roman gate, and drove through his native city, portions of the walls of which had been levelled to facilitate the decorations. He enjoyed the spectacle with the enthusiasm inherent in his race, and several times he bade the procession come to a halt that he might better examine some of the works of art. The order of the state entry, which corresponded with that of the "Possesso," had been arranged with minute attention by Paris de Grassis.* The magnificent spectacle seemed to the spectators to be like one of

* See *De ingressu S. P. Leonis X., Florentiam descriptio Paridis de Grassis*, ed. D. Moreni, Florentiae, 1793; LANDUCCI, 352 *seq.*; VASARI, V., 24 *seq.*, 341, VI., 141, 255. As to the journey and state entry, *cf.* *Ordine dell'entrata che fece P. Lione nella città di Firenze*, in C. Strozz., 239 (now 234), f. 1, State Archives, Florence; TIZIO, * *Hist. Senen.* in *Cod. G.*, II., 38, Chigi Library, Rome; G. UGHI, *Cronaca di Firenze*, in the *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, App. VII., 131; CORNELIUS DE FINE, * *Diary* (as eye-witness), in the National Library, Paris; SANUTO, XXI., 313. 344, 373 *seq.*, 391; MORENI, S. Lorenzo, I., 178; REUMONT, Andrea del Sarto, 66 *seq.*; FRANTZ, *Fra Bartolomeo*, 170, 177; D'ANCONA, *Origini*, II., 84 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, I., 321 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, *Hist.*, II., 219 *seq.*; MADELIN, 50. Later, Vasari immortalized Leo's entry into his native city by his picture in the Palazzo Vecchio. *Cf.* ROCCA, B. *Cerritanis Dialog.* 57 *seq.*

the triumphal processions of ancient Rome.* Taking part in it were to be seen eighteen Cardinals, as well as Lorenzo de' Medici and the Florentine municipality. The procession then went to the Duomo, where Cardinal Giulio de' Medici said Mass. Leo here laid aside his heavy Papal robes and tiara, and remained in his rochet and purple cloak, such as we see him in Raphael's portrait. In the Duomo the Pope prayed longer than usual, gave his blessing and indulgence, and then went to the cloister of Santa Maria Novella, where his predecessors, Martin V. and Eugenius IV., had dwelt in former times.

On the 1st of December Leo X. took counsel, first with the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, and then with the Cardinals assembled in Consistory, as to the ceremonies with which the victor of Marignano should be received.† Then there was a present for the King to be settled on. Paris de Grassis suggested a pax; but the Pope decided on a cross of pure gold, which had been the property of Cardinal Ascanio Sforza. This he took from the treasury of Julius II., who had hated the French so bitterly! Together with the precious stones with which it was set, the value of this cross amounted to 15,000 ducats.‡ On

* This comparison is taken from IOANNINENSIS (Penthatheucus, 102b), who declares that nothing more beautiful or magnificent had ever been seen.

† PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium, *loc. cit.*, epitome in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 26.

‡ * Papa re cum cardinalibus discussa statuit ei donare non pacem, quia nullam in promptu tunc haberet, sed unam crucem ex auro purissimo, quam habuerat ex thesauro Iulii quaeque fuerat olim card^{lis}. Ascanii et huic cruci fecit inseri etiam aliquos lapides preciosos, qui omnes in totum cum cruce valebant in circa 15m duc. et sic misit illa hora ad urbem pro cruce et postea eam donavit regi ex Bononia disces-suro ut infra dicitur. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.*, Rossiana Library, Vienna. See also BEMBI, Epist. XI., 11.

the first Sunday in Advent (Dec. 2), Mass was said in S. Lorenzo; after which the Pope was seen in tears, kneeling before the porphyry sarcophagus in which his father's body lay. No less moved was he when he visited his brother Giuliano, who was lying seriously ill in the family palace.*

On the 3rd of December Leo X. left his native city,† and on the 7th he arrived before Bologna, which he entered on the following day. The reception was just the opposite of that at Florence: no decorations, no acclamations greeted the Pope, who had shown too little interest in the adherents of the Bentivogli, and too much in their enemies.‡ Even a portion of the clergy

* SANUTO, XXI., 375; FABRONIUS, 94-95. As to the treatment of Giuliano, whose improvement in the autumn (*cf.* the *letter of Fil. Strozzi to Lorenzo, dated Florence, 1515, Sept. 26, and the *Report of John Bapt. Boncorti to Lorenzo, dated Florence, 1515, Oct. 7, State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CVIII. and CIX.) was only apparent, two Jewish doctors were sent from Rome to Florence (see TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 37, f. 341, Chigi Library, Rome). For the poem by Marcello Adriani Virgilio on Leo's visit to Lorenzo's tomb, see ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 141.

† On Dec. 2 an invitation was sent to Duke Charles of Savoy to take part in the Pope's meeting with the King at Bologna. * Brief, dated Florence, 1515, Dec. 2, State Archives, Florence. MAZZO, 19, n. 20.

‡ PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium* (Rossiana Library, Vienna): *Die lunae 3 Dec. papa recessit ex Florentia versus Bononiam ad quam die veneris applicant, sed non ingressus est, quia in domo cruciferorum suburbana pernoctavit et die sabbati octava post prandium intravit, sed satis ruditer et inordinatissime; nam cum ego per biduum aut triduum ante illucappulissem ordinassemque omnia pro receptione digna pontificis, nullus tamen ordo nec paratus nec ostentatio laetitiae aut signa saltem apparentia facta fuerunt propter quae ostenderunt cives se recepturos esse libenter pontificem, quinimo omnia signa in contrarium apparuerunt et forte creditum est, quod propter Bentivolos haec omnia contigerint, nam cum una pars Bononiensium vellent habere Bentivolos et papa tunc non introduceret ut obtulerit propterea erant mali contenti; altera pars ex adverso intelligens quod papa volebat eos omnino intromittere

showed animosity. In some of the streets even the cry of "Sega! Sega!" the motto of the Bentivogli, who carried a saw (sega) on their arms, was raised.* Such as these did but poor service to their patrons, for after this there could be no question of a complete restoration of the Bentivogli.† Not only the Master of Ceremonies, but also the Cardinals, were incensed by the hostile attitude of the Bolognese. They tried to persuade the Pope to express his displeasure; but he refused, and maintained the cheerful demeanour of a true diplomatist, who in cases such as this prudently appears to notice nothing.‡

The French King's Envoys, Odet de Foix and Louis de Trémouille, arrived in Bologna at almost the same time

erant pessime contenti et sic neutra pars erat contenta de hoc pontificis adventu. The following from MADELIN, 51-52. About Leo X. and Bologna in 1515, see Regest. Leonis X., n. 3313, 3855. Cf. SANUTO, XXI., 371, 391. A description of the Pope's entry (circa le XXI. hore) is given also by Aless. Gabbioneta in two *letters, both dated from Bologna, 1515, Dec. 8. In the second of these he writes with indignation about this "entrata brutta et infame: et questo è proceduto per la fredezza di questi Bolognesi. Li archi et altri ornamenti erano brutissimi et il più bello spectaculo è stato quello delle donne, quale credo siano le più brute del mondo." Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

* TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 38, Chigi Library, Rome. FABRONIUS, 95. See *Letter of Gabbioneta of Dec. 10, quoted in the following note.

† *Lo applauso ch'ha fatto questo populo per la restitutione di Bentivolii in casa con gridar Sega, Sega ha molto nociuto a questi poveri sig^{ri} Bentivolii perchè pare che la sia diferita. *Letter of Gabbioneta, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 10. On Dec. 15 he again writes: *Quello cridar Sega, Sega è stato la ruina di Bentivolii. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ *Ego dixi papae honori suo male consultum per cives Bononienses et papa visus est non curare semper subridens de his. At the end of his description of the entry, Paris de Grassis says again: *Et quidem parce si non ignominiose se Bononienses hac vice habuerunt versus pontificem, qui tamen adversus eos in nullo aperuit os suum. Rossiana Library, Vienna.

as the Pope. Francis I., who had been received at Parma by Lorenzo de' Medici and four prelates, and on the frontier of the States of the Church by Cardinals Medici and Fieschi, now hastened his journey, so that by the 10th of December he was only three miles from Bologna, on the bridge over the Reno. There he was met by Cardinal Sanseverino and the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, with whom all the details of the interview, as well as the state entry, were arranged. There were difficulties at this meeting which were not all due to the pedantic Master of Ceremonies, and the wit and pleasantries to which he treated the King. A difference of opinion soon showed itself, for the Pope had no intention of prolonging the visit to the extent which Francis had arranged in his own mind.*

According to prearrangement, the French King arrived at Bologna on the 11th of December, amid the pealing of bells.† Francis I. rode a fiery steed, being accompanied by the Legates, and later by Cardinals Sanseverino and Este. Nineteen other Cardinals waited to receive him at the Porta San Felice. As senior Cardinal, Riario made a short speech in Latin, during which the others uncovered their heads. The victor of Marignano answered in French, with his head also uncovered. Neither Francis nor his suite carried arms. The bold and masterful bearing of the King, and still more his noble countenance, made the best

* See PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, *loc. cit.*; MADELIN, 52-58, 66, where, however, the 8th of December should be read instead of the 5th.

† For what follows, see, besides Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 29 *seq.*, and FABRONIUS, 280 *seq.*, the account given in SANUTO, XXI., 378 *seq.*, 380 *seq.*, 392 *seq.* Also the account given by the Imperial Ambassador in LE GLAY, II., 85; TIZIO, * *Hist. Senen.* in Cod. G, II., 38, Chigi Library, Rome; * *Account of Stazio Gadio*, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 11, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua; BARILLON, I., 166 *seq.*; MADELIN, 59-65.

of impressions on the susceptible Italians; but his suite and the whole procession disappointed the thousands of spectators who had thronged to see it.* When the procession approached the Palazzo Pubblico, where Francis I. was to be the guest of the Pope, Leo could not refrain from going to the window to enjoy the rare spectacle.

After the King had dined with Cardinals Bibbiena, Medici, Sauli, and Cibo, he was presented to the Pope, who awaited him in the great hall on the second floor of the Palazzo Pubblico, surrounded by the Cardinals who had been summoned to the Consistory. So many spectators had crowded into the great tapestried hall,† that there was fear lest the floor might fall in. There was such a dense crowd that it was only with difficulty that the King, conducted by the Master of Ceremonies, could reach the throne of Leo X. Francis I. bared his head, made the three customary genuflections, and kissed the foot and hand of the Pope, who wore a jewelled tiara, and a cloak embroidered with gold. Leo bade the King rise, and embraced him with the intimation that he might cover his head.‡

To a short speech in French by Francis I., Leo replied with as much courtesy as readiness. Then the Chancellor Du Prat stepped forward and made the discourse of the *obedientia*.§ He began by an extravagant eulogy of the

* * Report of Gabbioneta, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 12, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. LE GLAY, II., 90.

† * Era aparata tuta la sala grande del palatio di tapezarie, dove era tuta la passion di N. S^{co} Dio, bellissima cosa. * Report of Grossino, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 11, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ * Lo qual lo abbracciò et tenne alquanto il volto suo presso quel del Re, accarezzandolo molto teneramente et fattolo coprire parlò seco un pocho. * Report of Stazio Gadio, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 11, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ Printed in ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., 296-302 (ROSCOE-HENKE, II., 466-470).

wisdom, skill, and state of the family of Medici, especially of its most famous member, the Pope, to whom God had entrusted the barque of St. Peter, to steer it through the shoals into the haven of safety. The Kings of France, continued the Chancellor, had from of old surpassed all other Christian princes in their devotion to the Holy See. Treading in their footsteps, His Majesty Francis I., in spite of the disdain of advisers who were of a different mind from himself, had hastened over mountains and valleys, forests and rivers, and had run the gauntlet of the Swiss, in order to do homage to the Pope, as an eldest son to his father, and the Vicar of Christ, and lay all that he had at his feet. While these words were being said the King wanted again to uncover his head ; this, however, the Pope would not permit. Leo replied to the discourse with great skill and elegance.

There followed on this the presentation to the Pope of the principal members of the King's suite. After this, Leo X., taking the King by the hand, led him into another room, from which he retired for a few moments to remove his heavy robes. He then returned to Francis I., whom he found standing at a window with some of the Cardinals, and spoke to him alone for two hours. The Master of Ceremonies had warned His Holiness beforehand against putting his hand to his biretta, as Alexander VI. had done to Charles VIII., before the eyes of the crowd under the windows, as such a mark of respect was unbecoming the Vicar of Christ, even if paid to the highest of temporal sovereigns.

On the following day the Pope and King resumed the subject of their discussion of the previous day, but nothing is known of what transpired. First Leo X. visited the King, who met him on Bramante's stairs; and in the evening there followed a longer interview

between them, about which but little or nothing is known. The same process was repeated on the 13th of December.*

On the morning of that day the Pope celebrated high mass with all possible pomp† in San Petronio, the largest church in Bologna. The spacious building was filled to overflowing, and at last the doors had to be closed to prevent accidents.‡ Francis I. was lavish in his attentions to the Supreme Head of the Church. He even wished to carry his train; and when the Pope declined this service, the King responded that he would gladly wait on the Vicar of Christ in the smallest things. But he refused to receive Holy Communion at his Mass. Forty of his suite, however, received the Body of our Lord from the hands of the Pope. A remarkable incident occurred during the solemnity. A French nobleman cried out suddenly in his native tongue that he wished to go to confession to the Pope; but that, as this could not be done secretly, he wished to accuse himself publicly of having fought with great bitterness against Julius II., and of having disregarded the ban of excommunication. When the King heard these words, he made no hesitation in declaring himself guilty of

* See the Report of the Imperial Ambassador in LE GLAY, II., 87; and SANUTO, XXI., 377, 380, 383.

† *Con tutta la pompa che sia stato possibile a usar, says Grossino in his description, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 13. In spite of all the precautions taken by Paris de Grassis, there was, on this occasion, some strife between the Italians and the French. As to the ceremony, see also the *Report of Gabbioneta, Dec. 14, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ Papa dixit dum exveheretur quod non credebat in uno loco tantum populum esse hoc tempore sicut nunc Bononiae et in veritate sic fuit, nam si non fecissemus claudi portas ecclesiae s. Petronii, ut non plures populani intrarent, timendum erat de suffocatione multorum et etiam sic vix sustinere potuerunt pressuram. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Rossiana Library, Vienna.

a similar offence. Many other nobles made the same confession, and begged for absolution, which the Pope, raising his hand, at once gave. Then Francis said to Leo X.: "Your Holiness must not be surprised that all these men hated Julius II., for he was our greatest enemy; in all our wars we have had no enemy so terrible as he, for Julius II. was indeed a most capable general, and far better suited to be such than to be Pope."* As on this occasion, so also on others did the Catholic spirit of the French King's suite declare itself. The Imperial Ambassador says that they kissed the Pope's feet nearly away!† The solemn *obedientia* of the King was at once communicated by the Pope to the mother of Francis, as well as to a number of friendly princes.‡ On the 14th of December the outside world learned one of the results of the interview between the Pope and the King; for on that day a Consistory was held, at which Adrian Gouffier de Boissy, Bishop of Coutances, and brother of the Admiral de Bonnivet, was created Cardinal. It was rumoured that the King had vainly tried to obtain a like dignity for the brothers of the Dukes of Bourbon and Vendôme. However that might be, Francis seemed very well pleased and in an amiable mood. He passed the evening with the Pope, who had invited him, with the Dukes of Bourbon and Vendôme, to eat with him. The suite of the King supped at a special table with Cardinals Medici, Bibbiena, and Cibo.§

* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 32, 33. Cf. MADELIN, 72.

† See LE GLAY, II., 89. Alessandro Gabbioneta wrote to Mantua on the 12th of December, 1515: *Non potria dir alla Ex. V. la furia de Francesi di voler basar el piede al papa. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ See BEMBI, Epist., XI., 1, n. 12, 47; SADOLET, Ep., 40; BREWER, II., 1, n. 1282. *Brief to Francesco Gonzaga, dat. Bologna, 1515, Dec. 14, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ Paris de Grassis, Diarium, in RAYNALDUS, 1515, n. 35 (cf. Notice des Ms. du Roi, II., 585); LE GLAY, II., 87-88; SANUTO, XXI., 395-

The friendly intercourse between the Pope and King was sealed, on the morning of the 15th of December, by the presentation to Francis of the beautiful jewelled gold cross mentioned above. The King venerated the relic of the True Cross which it contained, and then hastened to Leo X. to thank him and take leave of him. Their farewell interview lasted for half an hour. Nothing could exceed the expression of friendship on both sides. As the King left the Palace, he found some of the Cardinals in waiting to accompany him as far as the Porta San Felice, as they had done on his arrival. Many of the French suite remained behind to receive either absolution or other graces from the Pope, all of which he willingly gave.* By the end of December the French King was back in Milan, and returned to France at the beginning of the new year. Duke Charles of Bourbon was left behind as his representative in the capital of Lombardy.

Leo X. did not remain a single day longer than was necessary in Bologna, and on the 18th of December turned his back on the inhospitable city. On the 22nd he arrived in Florence, where his brother still lay grievously ill. Leo remained there for some time, and bestowed generous gifts on his beloved native city.† At last, on the 28th of February, 1516, to the great joy of the Romans and the

396 ; CARDELLA, IV., 12 ; CIACONIUS, III., 344 *seq.* A. Gabbioneta says in a postscript to his letter of Dec. 15, 1515 : *Heri sera la M^{ta} del Rè andò di sopra a cenar con la S^t di N. S. et con quella usò di grande humilità stando con lei in grandissima allegria. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

* PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.* Cf. FABRONIUS, 284, and DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 27. See also SANUTO, XXI., 395.

† LANDUCCI, 360-362 ; FRANTZ, Fra Bartolomeo, 182. Cf. RICHARD, VI., 112, 241 ; MORENI, S. Lorenzo, I., 186, 190 ; SADOLETI, Epist., 65 ; SANUTO, XXI., 441, 509 ; Paris de Grassis, ed. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 28 (die sabb. Dec. 25 should be corrected to Dec. 22).

members of the Curia,* the Pope returned to his capital. Owing to its being the season of Lent, his entry was kept with ecclesiastical solemnities only. The Golden Rose, blessed on Lætare Sunday, was destined this year for the French King.†

The strictest silence was observed as to the business transacted between Leo X. and Francis I. Paolo Giovio, who, by the Pope's desire, was working at his contemporary history, says, in a letter written at Bologna on the 15th of December, 1515, that he could find out nothing.‡ As time went on, the veil of secrecy was preserved all the more easily because nothing had been put on paper, and was scarcely raised at all where politics were concerned.§ It was Leo's way to conceal state secrets as far as he could from even his nearest advisers; and this time it was also better for the interests of France that nothing of what had taken place should be known prematurely. But the less people knew, the more fertile was their imagination, and their surmises were of the most hazardous description.|| It is

* SANUTO, XXII., 18; CORNELIUS DE FINE, *Diary, in the National Library, Paris.

† PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium, XII., 23, in Secret Archives and Rossiana Library. The edition in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 29, is incorrect.

‡ The letter of Giovio in SANUTO, XXI., 393.

§ Tra il Papa e il Re non è intervenuto scrittura alcuna. SANUTO, XXI., 396. Cf. M. Giorgi in ALBÈRI, II., 3, 45; and GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6. There was no later ratification of the secret arrangements. See BALAN, V., 511.

|| Cf. *TIZIO, Hist. Senen. in Cod. G., II., 38, of the Chigi Library; Rome and the *Diary of Cornelius de Fine, who writes: "Rex vero a s. pontifice in hac conventione magnis honestatur honoribus et ut ferebatur pontif. summus promiserat regi Gallo ut rebus suis faveret et pro posse eum ad culmen romani imperii senescente iam Max°. Caesare eveheret et ne interim imperiali titulo careret rumor fuit quod eum in imperatorem Constantinopolit. creasset cum hoc tamen pacto quod dictum imperium sua virtute

actually very difficult, and for the most part impossible, to be certain of what was discussed and decided upon at Bologna. What actually followed on the interview is all that can throw any light on most points.*

From what we know, the victor of Marignano went to meet the Pope at Bologna, with a full consciousness of his political supremacy, and prepared to make sweeping demands. Above all, he thought to persuade Leo X. to ally himself formally with France against Spain. But without directly declining this proposal, the Pope asked for time to decide on a matter of such importance, pointing out at the same time that his present alliance with Ferdinand of Spain would bind him for another sixteen months.† It is, moreover, certain that the question of the necessity of a combination among the Christian princes against the Turks came up between them. Francis I. made fair promises about this, in the same way that he made protestations to the Ambassadors remaining in Bologna of his desire for peace.‡

In view of the war against the Turks, Francis I. received, for one year, permission to raise a tithe from the French clergy.§ The Pope also complied with the French King's petition in favour of the enemy of Cardinal Schinner, Georg Supersaxo, who had been shut up a prisoner in the

et industria aggredereetur cuius rei postea Romae vidi pluribus in locis efficacissimum argumentum cum viderem in quibusdam Gallorum stolidorum domorum frontispiciis depicta gallici regis insignia imperiali corona et diademate ornata." National Library, Paris.

* MADELIN, 91-92.

† JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. 3.

‡ SADOLETI, *Epist.*, 53; BEMBI, *Epist.*, XI., 17; FRANC. NOVELLUS,

**Vita Leonis X.* in *Cod. Barb.*, lat. 2273, f. 11 *seq.*, Vatican Library; MADELIN, 69, 70, 75-76, 78, 94-95.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6.

Castle of St. Angelo in the autumn of 1514, and whom the Pope now discharged from prison.*

The preliminary articles of peace arranged at Viterbo on the 3rd of October between Leo X. and Francis I., were confirmed at Bologna. In accordance with this confirmation, the Pope, on December the 28th, 1515, warned the Swiss not to interfere with French property, or, in other words, with Milan. Soon after this the Swiss Nuncio, Filonardi, was told to accommodate himself to France in political matters.† Schinner was completely thrown over, though he does not seem to have troubled about the Pope's warning not to work against France.‡

In spite of his covenant with the French King, Leo was by no means minded to throw himself into the arms of France. The mission of Egidio Canisio to the Emperor Maximilian on the 13th of December, is a proof of this; for the object of this mission was to induce Maximilian to make peace with Venice, with the asseveration on the part of Leo X. that he would remain true to the old League with Germany.§ An unreserved agreement with France

* JOVIUS, Hist., XVI. (I., 259). Supersaxo's *Apology (MS. in Glys) says that at last Leo recognised his innocence (!) and set him free on condition that he brought no complaint against Cardinal Schinner. In a *Brief to Francis I., dat. Rome, 1516, Sept. 12, the Pope reminds the King of the promise he gave him at Bologna concerning Andreas di Albicis, cleric. Florent. Orig., L. 357, National Archives, Paris.

† BEMBI, Epist., XI., 18; Archiv f. schweiz. Gesch., XVI., 103. MADELIN (80 and 95) speaks incorrectly of Filonardi as the German Nuncio.

‡ Cf. ANSHELM, V., 213; Archiv f. schweiz. Gesch., XVI., 16 *seq.*

§ BEMBI, Epist., XI., 13, 14; *Brief to the German electors (corroborated by Egidio Canisio) dat. Scarcalasini Bonon. dioc. 1515, Dec. 20, Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 123, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. SANUTO, XXI., 417, XXII., 14, 26, 175; PIEPER, 52; VOLTELINI, 574; Miscell. in on. di A. Graf, Bergamo, 1903, 811.

seemed an impossibility, because of the ratification by the peace of Viterbo of the secession of Parma and Piacenza. An equal sacrifice was involved in the promise to give to the Duke of Ferrara not only Reggio,* but also Modena, provided the Duke would pay the purchase money of Modena and the expenses of the Holy See in regard to both towns.† If Francis I. thus, at anyrate partially, attained his objects, on the other hand his intercession for the Duke of Urbino, who had grossly violated his oath of fealty to the Holy See, failed completely.‡ However, the French King was quite ready to throw his friend over, all the more because the Pope just then made an unexpected concession to him in a far more important matter. In prospect of the death of Ferdinand the Catholic, which was bound, in the course of nature, to occur before long, Leo put before the French King the hope that he might be invested with the crown of Naples,§ on the condition that Francis would protect the Medici and refrain from interfering with the affairs of Tuscany.|| When, however, Ferdinand died on the 23rd of January, 1516,¶

* The cession of Reggio had been consented to in the agreement between Leo X. and Duke Alfonso on June 14, 1514. MURATORI, *Antich. Est.*, II., 317 *seq.*

† GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; MADELIN, 92-93. That such a promise had been made is conceded by the author of the rare pamphlet, *Riposta alla invectiva di D. Alphonso già duca de Ferrara*, Roma (1522), which was written entirely on the side of the Pope.

‡ See Letter of B. Costabili to Duke Alfonso, June 3, 1516, in BALAN, Boschetti, I., doc. 27. Cf. Chapter IV., *infra*.

§ See the very interesting letter of Francis I. to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Tarascona, 1516, Feb. 4, in REUMONT-BASCHET, *Cath. de Médicis*, 247-248 (see DESJARDINS, II., 764-765). Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; MADELIN (94) has overlooked both these testimonies.

|| See Letter of G. Gheri, Feb. 21, 1517, in VERDI, 21.

¶ The first news of this was received by Leo X. at Florence on Feb. 9, 1516. SANUTO, XXI., 510. Charles announced the death of

Maximilian's invasion of Northern Italy altered the political situation so completely that Francis I. was unable to undertake at once any measures against Naples,* though he by no means gave up his designs on that beautiful country.

Incomparably more important than this, and accompanied by greater and more lasting consequences, were the negotiations connected with the ecclesiastical affairs of the French kingdom. Francis I. obtained at once what he had already been promised, namely, the right to levy a tax on the French clergy. In accordance with his former promise, the Pope, though with some hesitation, granted the raising of a tithe for the crusade, first in 1516, and again in 1517. Together, these levies brought in to the victor of Marignano no less a sum than 400,000 livres.† What, however, meant much more was that the main lines of the famous Concordat were laid down at Bologna. This important measure has been described as due to the influence of Leo's ecclesiastical activity. With the Concordat was bound up the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, which had been contested so long and vehemently by the Holy See. Thus, though not without great sacrifices, an im-

Ferdinand to the Pope on Feb. 11, from Brussels. This letter of Charles to Leo X. in *Lett. d. princ.*, II., f. 12, of the Vatican Archives has been given by EHSES in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XIV., 832.

* How the Pope profited by the changed situation is shewn by the instructions given to Canossa. *Manosc. Torrig.*, XX., 21 *seq.*, 25, 26.

† IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 95. *Cf.* Chapters IV. and V. *infra*. In a *Brief to the King, dat. Rome, 1516, Nov. 3, Leo X. reminded Francis I. of a promise made by him at Bologna. It says there: *Cum sup. anno Bononiae congressi fuimus meminimus nos inter alia eo quo debebamus affectu, commendasse M^{ti} tuae ecclesiam Lateranen. ut tu ei favere velles in adipiscendo id quod cl. mem. Ludovicus XI. ultro ipsi ecclesiae ex voto antea fuerat dilargitus.* Orig. L. 357 in the National Archives, Paris.

portant victory was gained for the Church, and a dangerous political storm allayed.*

* RANKE (Päpste, I., 7, 54 *seq.*) gives great praise to Leo's statecraft. "He succeeded," says he, "in dispersing the storm that had threatened him, persuaded the King to return, and himself remained firm in the possession of his dominions. How fortunate this was for the Pontiff may be seen from the effects immediately produced by the mere approach of the French. It is highly deserving of remark that Leo, after his allies had been defeated and himself obliged to yield up a portion of his territory, was yet able to retain his hold on two provinces but lately conquered, accustomed to independence and replete with every element of revolt." Cf. BROSCHE, I., 45.

CHAPTER IV.

THE WAR OF URBINO.—CONSPIRACY OF CARDINAL PETRUCCI.
—THE GREAT CREATION OF CARDINALS, JULY 1, 1517.

THE good terms on which Leo apparently stood with the old friend of his family, Duke Francesco Maria of Urbino, at the beginning of his pontificate,* received a rude shock when Giuliano de' Medici fell ill and his young nephew Lorenzo was given supreme command of the Papal troops. The Duke of Urbino might reasonably have been affronted at being passed over; but, on the other hand, his subsequent conduct could not have failed to exasperate the Pope. Regardless of his oath of fealty, and in spite of admonitions and threats,† Francesco Maria, being already in secret communication with France, delayed at the most critical moment to send the assistance he was bound to give to the Papal troops. Moreover, after the victory of Francis I., the Duke of Urbino did all in his power to stir up the French King against the Pope.‡ When, in spite of his machinations, Leo and Francis I. made friends, such fear seized the Duke that he placed his only son for safety in the fortress of San Leo,§ and raised a body of troops.||

* UGOLINO, II., 197; MARCUCCI, Francesco Maria I. della Rovere, I., 27 *seq.* Cf. LUZIO'S rev. of Pastor's "Leo X." in the *Corriere della Sera*, 1906, No. 282.

† Cf. *Manosc. Torrig.*, XIX., 244.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; BALAN, V., 505 *seq.*

§ LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 217.

|| Report of G. Caprili to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, Jan. 1, 1516, in BALAN, V., 512.

The fate of the Duke had been decided at Bologna. In vain did Francis I. appeal for mercy on his behalf. The Pope maintained, amicably but firmly, that, Francesco Maria having forgotten his duty as feudatory, there could be no question of his pardon. Were he to be left unpunished, every petty baron in the States of the Church would do the same thing or worse. After this the King made no further attempt to save his friend.* The deposition of the Duke was a foregone conclusion; and it was furthermore decided that his Duchy should be given to Lorenzo de' Medici. This last development did not emanate from the Pope, but from the ambitious Alfonsina Orsini, who was determined at any cost to see a princely crown on her son's head.† Unfortunately, Leo did not this time have the strength of mind to resist the wishes of his sister-in-law, which he had shown when that ambitious woman had hoped to secure for Lorenzo the usurped principality of Piombino. The Pope now agreed to the proposal, though he did not conceal the fact that he yielded unwillingly. Once, however, he had given his consent, nothing would move him.‡ Even the representations of his brother made no impression on him. In vain did Giuliano remind him that, in the years of their exile, the Medici had always found hospitality at the court of Urbino.§ Intercession was useless, and before Leo had left Florence at the end of January, 1516, proceedings had been begun

* See the account of B. Costabili in BALAN, Boschetti, I., 72; GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; VETTORI, 315. Cf. MADELIN, 93.

† JOVIUS (Vita, lib. 3, and Elogia, 322). GUICCIARDINI (XII., 6) and VETTORI (321) agree in saying that it was Alfonsina Orsini who induced the Pope to take measures against Urbino. Cf. the Letter of Alfonsina to Lorenzo, dat. Nov. 3, 1515 (quoted by NITTI, 71), in which she says: "La mira mia è in su Urbino"; and LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 223, n. 4.

‡ Cf. NITTI, 75 *seq.*

§ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; SANUTO, XXI., 510.

against the Duke of Urbino.* On the 1st of March Francesco Maria was summoned to Rome, under the severest penalties if he disobeyed. If he did not put in an appearance under eighteen days, he would have to give an account of a number of grievous misdeeds. A considerable array of accusations were raised against him. These included his refusal to join Lorenzo de' Medici in his expedition against the French, although he had received the necessary pay for his troops; his understanding with the enemy; and his participation in the murder of Cardinal Alidosi, and other incidents in the pontificate of Julius II.† The accusation about the murder of Alidosi was undeniably a mere pretext, because Francesco Maria had been fully acquitted of all participation in it by Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici himself. The same thing cannot, however, be said of the other counts. The refused fealty and the understanding with France were offences which called for punishment from a legal point of view. Nevertheless, the whole action of the Pope, especially when we consider the hospitality shown by the Duke of Urbino to the exiled Medici, has something repulsive about it. The impression left on the mind is that he cared less that justice should take its course, than that the Duchy should become available for his nephew.‡

* On hearing this, Duke Charles of Bourbon interceded himself for Francesco Maria, but equally in vain. See *Copy of the Brief to Charles of Bourbon, dat. Florence, Feb. 9, 1516, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. Cf. Arm., LXIV., t. 5, n. 85, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† SANUTO, XXI., 496; GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; VETTORI, 319. Cf. BALAN, V., 513, 514, and R. BOSCHETTI, I., 98-99; also the quotation in Appendix, No. 11. (Secret Archives of the Vatican.)

‡ That the same impression was given to contemporaries, besides being shown in JOVIUS, Vita, l. 3, is to be seen in the *Diary of Cornelius de Fine, National Library, Paris.

Francesco Maria did not dream of obeying the summons to Rome, and set his hopes on mollifying the Pope through a third party. With this object he sent to Rome the noble Duchess Elisabetta Gonzaga, the widow of his predecessor. But her prayers and tears were of no avail; Leo was not to be moved,* and the only point gained by her intercession was the suspension of his citation to Rome, during her absence in the Eternal City. But on the 11th of March the document was printed and published.† The Duke might have profited by the intercession of Giuliano de' Medici, had he not been too grievously ill to take any active measures. Therefore things took their course in Rome. The time given to the Duke for his personal vindication expired without his putting in an appearance. On the 14th of March, a Papal Bull was published which declared that Francesco Maria, on account of his repeated breaches of fealty, was deprived of all his possessions in the States of the Church.‡

A few days later, on the 17th of March 1516, the consumptive Giuliano de Medici breathed his last at Fiesole, at the age of thirty-seven.§ His widow Filiberta returned

* Cf. the full narrative of the Duchess herself in LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova, 229. See also in BALAN, V., 513, and R. BOSCHETTI, I., 97, the **Letters of Elisabetta Gonzaga to Francesco Maria, dat. Rome, 1516, April 18 and 20; also a *Letter of Castiglione, dat. Rome, 1516, April 18, Mantua Library.

† See Caprili's accounts, March 3 and March 11, 1516, in BALAN, Boschetti, I., 97-98.

‡ SANUTO, XXII., 51. If we take this account, it must be admitted that the Bull was published before the expiration of the time fixed. But such an unusual proceeding requires still further confirmation.

§ CAMBI, XXII., 93; LANDUCCI, 362; SANUTO, XXII., 51, 55, 56, 79. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 29. Bibbiena was present when he died. Bembo personally assisted him; see BEMBO, Lettere, I., 25 *seq.* The letter in which Bibbiena announced the death of Giuliano to the

shortly after to her sister Louisa, the mother of Francis I., taking back with her her costly trousseau. Her brief marriage had been childless.* Not only did the Pope grieve for Giuliano, but he was mourned sincerely throughout Florence; for, says Vettori, he was a truly good man, without strength, but with no evil in him; he was, however, too generous.† In him Francesco Maria lost his most powerful intercessor, and his last hope now rested in Francis I. The Duke had every hope that the French King would at last take up his cause, for the friendship between Francis and the Pope, which had seemed to be so firmly established, now showed signs of waning. The advantages which the victor had wrung from the defenceless Leo under the cloak of great friendship, had been so great that it was impossible that the amicable footing of the contracting parties should continue for long. To the Pope the dominion of the French in Milan was in itself hateful; but the loss of Parma and Piacenza never ceased from galling him in an especial manner. Had Francis I. acted as a wise statesman, he would have avoided the mortification connected with the sequestration of those cities.‡ Leo X. had, however, to put up for a while with what he could not prevent. The other arrangement, no less unpalatable to the Holy See, which related to the cession to the Duke of Ferrara of Modena and Reggio, was, however, so worded, that it was easy for an adroit diplomatist like

Marchioness of Mantua, in REUMONT-BASCHE, 249. Cf. CIAN, *Musa Medicea*, 8-9; and FESTER, Machiavelli, 114.

* JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. 3. Giuliano left behind him a natural son, Ippolito, born in Urbino in 1511, who later, as Cardinal, was a generous patron of learning. ROSCOE-BOSSI, V., 160. See also VI., 316 *seq.*, Ariosto's canzone on the death of Giuliano.

† Cf., however, *supra*, pp. 89-90, about Giuliano's immorality.

‡ This is justly remarked in ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., 28-29.

Leo X., not particular in the means he employed, to prevent its being carried out, on some pretext or other.* Francis learned to his dismay how little dependence could be placed on the Pope, when, in March, 1516, Maximilian crossed the Alps and declared war on the French and Venetians.† In presence of this danger, the French King, relying on the Pope's promise at Bologna, asked for the assistance of 500 men for the defence of Milan, or the alternative of payment for 3000 Swiss mercenaries. Leo, always in want of money, rejected the last alternative; but the troops which he promised instead were raised so slowly that Francis suspected a secret understanding between the Pope and the Emperor. His distrust was considerably increased by the mission to Maximilian of Cardinal Bibbiena, well known for his hatred of France, and by the liberation from prison of Marc Antonio Colonna, who, with a body of troops raised in the States of the Church, had hastened to help the Imperial party against the Venetians.‡

But Francis did the Pope a wrong. There is no doubt at all that the appearance south of the Alps of the Emperor with a considerable force, was an event not at

* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6. Alberto Pio di Carpi, in letters of Jan. 10 and 11, 1516, advised the Pope most urgently against consenting to such a diminution of the States of the Church. See *Mem. stor. di Carpi*, I., 215, II., 339 *seq.*; and *SEMPER*, Carpi, 11. Leo X. adroitly made use of the Emperor's expedition as a pretext for not carrying out his promise, *BALAN*, V., 511.

† ULMANN, II., 669 *seq.*; HUBER, III., 406 *seq.*

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6. As to Bibbiena's mission, which was decided on in the beginning of March, see *SANUTO*, XXII., 39, 56, 79, 97, 100; and *Manosc. Torrig.*, ed. Guasti, XX., 28. Cf. *PIEPER*, 52. The *Deed by which Bibbiena was appointed "legatus de latere" to Maximilian I. is dated Id. Mart., 1515, that is, March 15, 1516. *Regest.* 1194, f. 199; cf. 1196, f. 55 (anno tertio), Secret Archives of the Vatican.

all desired by Rome.* The Pope knew how dangerous to the States of the Church were his far-reaching projects. What is more, he knew that not long before this, Maximilian had in no measured terms threatened Egidio Canisio, who had been appointed on an extraordinary mission to him, with a sweeping reform of the Curia.† The Pope's position as regarded the campaign of Maximilian, was the more difficult because he had to reckon with both parties, with each of whom he had made engagements. In order to keep on the safe side he tried, as he had often done before, to avoid taking any decided step until the fortune of war had declared itself for either side. It was fear, and his inveterate habit of veering from one side to the other, which governed his ambiguous course of action.‡ He

* Cf. the important autograph *letter of Cardinal Medici to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Rome, March 3, 1516, in which it is said: "Pensa anchor S. S^{ta} stare a vedere più che potra et se Francia non rovina subito porgerli aiuto per lo obbligo suo di qualche cent°. de huomini d'arme diche li altri havendo aiutato anchor loro non si potranno iustamente dolere; ma se li Fransesi si defenderano gagliardamente et faranno le provisioni a tempo S. S^{ta} andrà di miglior ghambe in adiutarli perche in facto la victoria de lo Imperatore non fa per la chiesa ne per voi costi che si vede hanno malo animo contro a cotesta città et credono cavarsi un thesoro." State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CXIII. f. 94.

† According to SANUTO, XXII., 39, this was Maximilian's response to Egidio's advocacy of a war against the Turks: *Opus est antea curare vineam Dei et poi attender contra infedeli*. To which M. Giorgi's account adds: *et quantum ad suscipiendum bellum contra infideles, oportet prius reformare ecclesiam, postea faciemus expeditionem* (ALBÈRI, II., 3, 43). As to Egidio's mission, see *supra*, Chap. III. Before him Leo X. had sent to Maximilian the poet Giangiorgio Trissino; see MORSOLIN, Trissino, 80 *seq.*

‡ This is the opinion of GUICCIARDINI (XII., 6) and VETTORI (317), which agrees with the reports of the Venetian Ambassador. On March 13 the latter writes thus: "Di colloqui col Papa zercha l'Imperador. Monstra di temer et l'orator li dice che le so' zente è con l'Imperador

rejected all offers made to him by the enemies of France, but would not throw in his lot with Francis I.; he neither dared recall Colonna nor send the desired help to the French King. When the Emperor's expedition met with reverses, Bibbiena was directed to stay at Rubiera, on the plea of illness, to watch the development of affairs. As these turned out very favourably to the French, the Pope sent through Lorenzo one month's payment for the Swiss mercenaries, which had been asked for some time before. Francis took the money, but, in spite of the Pope's excuses and professions of friendship conveyed to him by Canossa,* remained in the very worst of humours.† Ever since May he had been in a frame of mind hostile to the Papacy, giving evidence of designs on Naples, and of intervention about the Duke of Urbino. Con-

e non dia temer. Li risponde: Convegno cussì per no lo tuor inimico, perchè, vincendo, mi persequiteria, convegneria andar in Avignon etc. et par sii con Franza et desiderar ogni ben di Sua Maesta; sichè il Papa tegrirà da chi vincerà." SANUTO, XXII., 50-51, *cf.* 56, 108, 120, 159; ALBÈRI, II., 3, 49. What Bald. da Pescia writes in cipher to Lorenzo de' Medici from Rome, on March 4, 1516, is very characteristic: *Mons dice che N.S. visto queste cose dell' Imperadore ringagliardirsi et sendo S. Sta desiderosa di non mancare a Francia pensa sotto colore di volere fare l'impresa d'Urbino mettere in ordine tucte sue gente tantum per servirsene in questa impresa quanto adiutarsi et defendere le cose sue et quelle di Francia et questo lo fara per non demonstrare all' Imperadore per hora che voglia armarsi contro di lui. State Archives, Florence, Av. il princ., CIX. See also Manosc. Torrig., XX., 26-27. GISI in Arch. für schweiz. Gesch., XV., 254. PERRENS, III., 58 *seq.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 676; CIPOLLA, 847; VERDI, 24.

* *Cf.* Manosc. Torrig., XX., 30 *seq.*, 33 *seq.*, 39, 41 *seq.*

† GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6; especially as regards Bibbiena, SANUTO, XXII., 108, 120, 124, 140, 294, 455. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 33 *seq.* 36 *seq.*, 41, 49. BREWER, II., 2, 3545. About the King's temper, see the relation of M. Giorgi in ALBÈRI, II., 3, 46.

sequently Leo, on his side, took up a less friendly attitude towards France.*

Francis was soon to feel the effect of this in a variety of ways; especially in Switzerland, where the Papal Nuncios ventured to promote the Anglo-Imperial machinations.† The Pope forbade any open union with the enemies of France, yet he held out the possibility of such a measure as a threat. This was sufficient to decide Francis I. to leave the Duke of Urbino to his fate.

At first Francesco Maria contemplated resistance; but as soon as he understood that Lorenzo de' Medici was advancing on Urbino on three sides, at the head of an army of combined Papal and Florentine troops,‡ he fled to Pesaro, and thence to Mantua, to his father-in-law, Francesco Gonzaga, to whom he had already sent his family. Urbino and Pesaro surrendered at once, and Sinigaglia offered very slight resistance. Before long the fortresses of Pesaro and Maiuolo fell also, and only the fortress of San Leo held out. In a few days nearly the whole Duchy had succumbed.§ Leo received the news of this on the 4th and 5th of June, 1516.|| Even if there were

* Cf. WIRZ, Filonardi, 44-47, who shows that from the end of 1515 till the spring of 1516 the Pope had had no share in the opposition with which France met in Switzerland, and that the Nuncio Filonardi did nothing to promote it. The situation changed with the appointment of the second Nuncio, Gambara: in May 1516, says WIRZ (47) with truth, the Pope ceased to be friendly towards France; and that is the time that France began to be anti-Papal.

† See WIRZ, Filonardi, 47.

‡ Bologna supplied part of the artillery; cf. the *Brief to that city, dat. Rome, May 5, 1516. State Archives, Bologna.

§ Cf. the accounts in SANUTO, XXII., 184, 269, 286, 309-311 and 353-354; GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6. See, further, LEONI, 186 *seq.*; UGOLINI, II., 205 *seq.*; and the corrected statement in BALAN, V., 515.

|| Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1516, 83.

not wanting those who celebrated the event in Rome with rejoicings,* there were many who justly reproached the Pope for his ingratitude towards the fallen dynasty. The excuses which Leo alleged were the outrages which he had suffered at the hands of the Duke, and the justice of the punishment inflicted on him as an unfaithful vassal and a soldier who had detained troops for whom he had received pay. Above all, the Pope pleaded the impossibility of retaining in his States so unfaithful a feudatory, who was certain at the very first opportunity to have dealings with his enemies.† Even Francesco Vettori, by no means a Papal partisan, is of opinion that Leo could not by any means have left the Duke's offence unpunished.‡ But, on the other hand, the severity shown on the occasion by the Pope cannot be overlooked,§ for it was not in keeping with his great position of Supreme Head of the Church. To most contemporaries the conduct of Leo X. seemed hard and unjust,|| and as though actuated solely by regard for the private interests of the house of Medici;¶ as was proved by the fact of the crown of the dispossessed prince being at once given to the nephew of the Pope.

Leo X. had scarcely recovered from a serious illness,**

* SANUTO, XXII., 323.

† GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6. Cf. SANUTO, XXII., 184.

‡ VETTORI, 319.

§ We can see the lengths to which this severity was carried in Agost. Gonzaga's *Letter of Sept. 5, 1516, Mantua Library. See Appendix, No. 13.

|| Cf. the opinions of Giovio and RANKE (Zur Kritik, 73*) as examples of different views placed in juxtaposition.

¶ Cf. LÜTOLF, Die Schweizergarde, Einsiedeln, 1859, 19-20; also about the death of the captain of the Swiss, Kaspar von Silinon.

** Cf. Parenti in VERDI, 26, and Paris de Grassis, who reports in August: *Infirmis et sanitas insperata pontificis. Diebus istis multus fuit rumor curiae universae de gravi et quasi insanabili aegritudine

when he learned the course events had taken. On the 18th of August, 1516, Lorenzo was invested with the title of Duke of Urbino, the revenues of which, including Pesaro and Sinigaglia, amounted then to only 25,000 ducats.* He was at the same time declared Lord of Pesaro. All the Cardinals signed the deed of investiture except Domenico Grimani, who left Rome in a state of indignation.†

The conquest of Urbino aggravated the already strained relations between Leo X. and Francis I. The French King‡ had been quite as unwilling as the Emperor to see Francesco Maria driven out of his Duchy.§ Francis I.'s dearest wish was not only to prevent any increase of

pontificis nostri ita ut quandoque cogitatum fuit de paratu eorum, quae ad conclave pertinent. Aegritudo autem fuit fistula in natibus cum orificiis quinque et febres acutae cum somnis continuis, quos subeeticos dicunt et maius periculum erat quia, ut dicebatur, ipse de se ipso multum timebat, quod cum fletu crebro testabatur. Accedebat quia quidam frater Bonaventura (*cf.* Vol. V. of this work, 224), qui se spiritum propheticum habere profitebatur, hanc mortem annuntiavit et etiam aliquorum qui paucis ante diebus omnes mortui erant et ille praedixerat et papa incarcerare iussit et saepe examinari de hac re; ille autem multo magis semper affirmabat et addebat quod nisi sic esse cremari volebat et tandem vanitates apparuerunt et papa sanatus est ac die lunae, XVIII. (Augusti), tenuit consistorium ac sequenti die ivit ad ecclesiam s. Mariae de populo, ubi audivit missam bassam et egit gratias Deo. Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23. See also the *Letter of C. Agnello from Mantua, dat. Rome, Aug. 2, 1516; Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

* GUICCIARDINI (XII., 6) states this emphatically. The account on which SUGENHEIM relies for his statement (423) says that Urbino was worth 100,000 scudi annually (see SIENA, Sinigaglia, 361), dates from the second half of the 16th century.

† SANUTO, XXII., 456, 474. Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1516, n. 83.

‡ ULMANN, II., 690-691; MORSOLIN, Trissino, 400.

§ VERDI, 26, 37.

the Pope's power, but rather to see it weakened; yet now he had to look on and see Leo putting difficulties in the way which threatened the foreign policy of France.* The fact was that the Pope was trying to keep the Catholic King from forming an alliance with France, while at the same time the Papal Nuncio was seeking to prejudice Switzerland against the same country.† Prospero and Muzio Colonna, as well as Girolamo Morone, from whom an attempt against Milan might be feared, considered it safer to remain on Papal territory. Francis went so far as to believe that Leo was mixed up in the negotiations which were being carried on between the Emperor, England, and Switzerland, with the object of seizing Milan. On this account he endeavoured to regain the friendship of the Medici Pope. In August he sent a force to help him against the corsairs of Tunis, who were molesting the coasts of the States of the Church, and who, at the end of April, had almost captured the Pope, while he was hunting near the mouth of the Tiber.‡

In other ways also the French King sought to curry favour with the Pope. But Leo detested the dominion of the French in Italy for itself, and still more bitterly resented having been compelled to give up Parma and Piacenza. No attentions on the part of Francis I. could compensate for this. Thus the relations remained strained

* For what follows, *cf.* GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6.

† Filonardi was instructed by the Pope to observe greater precaution (see WIRZ, 47-48); but he was not recalled, as Francis I. wished. It was only in August 1517 that he was replaced by A. Pucci; see Abschiede, III., 2, 1077; WIRZ, Filonardi, 50. Perhaps Francis had heard of the plan for a marriage of Lorenzo de' Medici with a sister of Charles V., which was, however, given up for that which the Pope planned in the summer of 1516. ULMANN, II., 691.

‡ SANUTO, XXII., 183-184, 456; Manosc. Torrig., XX., 48; GUICCIARDINI, XII., 6.

on both sides. Leo would not accede to the expressed desire of the French King for the recall of Filonardi; and the French Ambassador made no secret of his displeasure. "I know not," said he in September, "what more the Pope will do. He controls Florence and Siena,* and now he has taken possession of Urbino. He had better not think of Ferrara, for I have orders from my King to demand of him the cession to the Duke of Reggio and Modena. This is not the right moment to speak of Naples."† The Neapolitan question was just then occupying the minds of the Ambassadors both of France and Spain, who had met at Noyon, where the following agreement was come to on the 13th of August, 1516. Francis I. and Charles V. concluded a peace in perpetuity, and a treaty for the mutual protection of their states against all comers. The French King renounced his claims on Naples in favour of his one-year-old daughter, Louise, whom Charles promised to marry as soon as she was twelve years old. Till the accomplishment of the marriage, Charles undertook the annual payment of 100,000 crowns, and after that the payment of half that sum until a child should be born of the marriage. A further stipulation which concerned the kingdom of Navarre was left so vague that it could easily be broken; Francis I. wished to keep such a way open whereby to escape from the pledges he had made, for his object in signing this agreement was to prevent Charles from joining the anti-French coalition proposed by England.‡ But neither did Charles give his definite adherence

* As to Florence, see Chap. II., *supra*. In Siena, Raffaello Petrucci had, with the co-operation of the Pope, driven out Borghese Petrucci. Raffaello promised to keep Siena true to the policy of the Medici. See NITTI, 75-76.

† SANUTO, XXII., 523.

‡ DUMONT, IV., 1, 224 *seq*; LANZ, *Einleitung*, 177 *seq*; BAUM-

to that upon which his Dutch advisers at Noyon had agreed, when the only thing they considered was peace at any price with France. A six weeks' limit had been allowed for the ratification, which Charles had extended by another month, so as to find time in the interim to negotiate with England. Henry VIII., who regarded the treaty of Noyon as a serious check, left no means untried to win Charles over.* This he succeeded in doing, for the Noyon articles were not favourable to the King of Spain. In London, whither Cardinal Schinner went in person, a new treaty, of decidedly anti-French tendency, was prepared on the 29th of October. The contracting parties were Henry VIII. and the Emperor Maximilian. The ostensible object of their alliance was the mutual protection of their states, the furtherance of universal peace, and the promotion of a general war against the Turks. They bound themselves in perpetuity to guarantee the safety of their actual and future possessions. The treaty was presented for approbation to Charles of Spain as well as to the Pope, who, through his Nuncio, had declared himself to be neutral.† As regards the Pope, the deed ran thus: "Under the conviction that this treaty, being a guarantee of universal peace and the promotion of war against the Turks, must have the consent of the Holy Father, he is included in it as its head and as the participator in all its benefits, if he sanctions the articles and puts them in force by a contribution *pro rata*; and if, moreover, he pronounces the ban of excommunication against any aggressor, with-

GARTEN, Karl V., I., 42 *seq.* Besides the Noyon agreement made known to us by Dumont, there were secret articles drawn up (DE LEVA, I., 235-236 *seq.*) about which nothing is known.

* LANZ, Einleitung, 181; BAUMGARTEN, Karl V., I., 43 *seq.*

† Report from London of Seb. Giustiniani, Sept. 22, 1516, in SANUTO, XXII., I., 98. Cf. BREWER, II., n. 2495.

out absolution, except with the consent of all contracting parties. He must come to a decision and ratify these terms within six months."*

But this agreement, which was to be ratified within two months, remained only on paper. The Emperor Maximilian at the Brussels Convention gave his adherence to the Noyon Treaty on the 3rd of December, 1516, and promised to evacuate Verona, which he did in January of the following year.† The Swiss, who had been expressly invited to accede to the London Convention, made a peace in perpetuity with France on the 29th of November, 1516.‡

To all appearances the alliance between Francis I. and the Emperor was cemented in the spring of the following year. On the 11th of March, at a conference held at Cambrai, a League was made between Maximilian and the Kings of France and Spain. In May and July not only was this treaty ratified, but some secret clauses were added, the object of which was nothing less than the division of Northern and Central Italy into kingdoms, to be made into Imperial fiefs—Venice, west of Vicenza, with Modena, Milan, Mantua, Montferrat, Piedmont, Asti, and Genoa, were to constitute the kingdom of Lombardy, and to belong to Francis I.; the eastern part of Venice, with Padua, Treviso, Florence, Pisa, Leghorn, and Siena were to form the Italian kingdom, and to be given either to King Charles or his brother Ferdinand.§ There is no doubt

* DUMONT, IV., 1, 240. (Here Oct. 29 should be read instead of Oct. 19.) LANZ, Aktenstücke und Briefe (Monum. Habsburg.), 29 *seq.*

† See Wiener Jahrb. d. Literat., 111 (1845), 177 *seq.*; ULMANN, II., 686 *seq.*; BROSCH, England, VI., 91.

‡ DUMONT, IV., 1, 248 *seq.*; Abschiede, III., 2, 1406 *seq.*; DIERAUER, II., 461 *seq.*

§ DUMONT, IV., 1, 256 *seq.*; LANZ, Aktenstücke und Briefe, 36; *Ibid.*, Einleitung, 182 *seq.*

whatever that by the atrocious Treaty of Cambrai, Francis I. had no object but to entrap the Emperor, and reduce Venice as well as the Pope to a state of pliancy and servitude.*

Probably no one knew better than the French King how much depended on the attitude taken by the Pope. On the 17th of May, Bulls from Rome were prepared which, in accordance with the agreement of Bologna, permitted Francis I. to raise a crusade-tithe in his kingdom, including Brittany.† But it was only in August, after the negotiations about the Concordat were concluded, that these Bulls were issued, having been rewritten at the King's request. Francis returned thanks to the Pope in a letter to which he added a couple of autograph lines. In this letter he announced the conclusion of the Treaty of Noyon.‡ Leo did not allow the anxiety he felt at the alliance between the French King and the young Hapsburg to be perceived, and sent his good wishes to Francis I.§ Going on to remind him of the covenant between them, he professed his readiness to recall his Swiss Nuncio.|| On the 6th of September he thanked the King for his letter, assured him

* This opinion, first mentioned by LANZ (Einleitung, 183), is shared by BAUMGARTEN (Karl V., I., 55) and ULMANN (II., 689).

† *The Bull *Etsi dispositione superna*, dat. Romae, 1516, XVI., Cal. Iunii, Anno 4; Regest. 1193, f. 184-186. The extension to Brittany in the *Bull *Ad hoc nos decus*, dat. Romae, 1516, XVI., Cal. Iunii, Anno 4; Regest. 1204, f. 146-147^b.

‡ SANUTO, XXII., 539. Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 228.

§ *Brief to Francis I., dat. Rome, Aug. 22, 1516: Tenore praesentium omnes et singulas gratias etiam forum conscientiae tuae concernentes M^{ti}. Tuae ut praefertur concessas validas, efficaces et integras fore decernimus et declaramus et pro potiori tutela quatenus opus sit illas de novo concedimus. Orig. L., 357, National Archives, Paris.

|| SANUTO, XXII., 540.

of his good wishes, and for everything else referred him to his Nuncio, Canossa.*

The Nuncios in Switzerland were at the same time admonished to behave in such a way that the French King could in no way take exception.† Soon after this, Francis I. received a privilege in respect of Milan, in accordance with which no consistorial benefice should be conferred on anyone obnoxious to the Crown.‡ The imminence of the Turkish peril gave Leo the opportunity, in October, of once more appealing urgently for help in that quarter. The King in return professed his zeal in the cause of a Crusade, though it must be confessed that he expressed himself in a somewhat ambiguous manner.§ This annoyed the Pope; all the more because Francis expressed suspicion that the Pope was not acting honestly by him.|| On the top of this came the pressure put on him by Francis to hand over Modena and Reggio to the Duke of Ferrara. The report that Leo wished to make Lorenzo Duke of Romagna did not facilitate an agreement. "The Pope," declared the French Ambassador, "is making himself the master of the whole of Italy, and we shall have to go back across the mountains!"¶ Friction was increased by the complaint

* Leo X. to Francis I., dat. Rome, Sept. 6, 1516 (composed by Sadolet). In this letter the Pope refers to the above-mentioned letter to Francis I., *supra*, 162: *Litterae M^{tes} Tuae, quibus gratam tibi vehementer ostendis nostram decimarum et cruciatae tibi factam concessionem summa nos iucunditate affecerunt.* Orig. in the National Archives, Paris (L. 357).

† Manosc. Torrig., XX., 231 *seq.*; *cf.* 237 *seq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, 236 *seq.*

§ See Letter of Leo X., Oct. 17 (Bembo), and the answer of Francis, Nov. 15, 1516, in CHARRIÈRE, I., 13-18; SANUTO, XXIII., 268; Manosc. Torrig., XX., 238 *seq.*

|| *Cf.* the very characteristic letter of Cardinal Medici to Canossa, Manosc. Torrig., XX., 242.

¶ SANUTO, XXIII., 232.

raised by Francis I. that Schinner had gone, by the consent of the Pope, to London to conclude the treaty of October. At the same time the French King urged the Pope, through the Nuncio, to beware of Charles and Maximilian, who, said he, wished to combine to rob the Holy See of its temporal power. This warning had the effect of making Leo X. formally disavow Cardinal Schinner.* On the 19th there was sent to the Swiss an exhortation to make peace,† which had an influence on the ratification of the arrangement of the 24th of November. On the 25th the Papal chamberlain Latino Benassao was sent on an extraordinary mission to France, as the Pope could not agree with the representative of Francis at Rome. Gossip was rife as to the object of this mission; though it really treated of the cementing of a closer friendship with France by the marriage of Lorenzo.‡ Although the money collected in his country for a Crusade was now, as he had long desired, at the free disposal of the King,§ an agreement was as far off as ever. At the end of December, Leo X. complained to the Venetian Ambassador that the French King suspected him of desiring the possession of Ferrara, and that this was the reason why

* SANUTO, XXIII., 233; LANZ, *Einleitung*, 185.

† CHARRIÈRE, I., 16, n.

‡ *Brief to Canossa, dat. Rome, Nov. 25, 1516 (Benassao was directed to avoid all dissension), Arm. XLIV., t. 5, f. 90; Secret Archives of the Vatican. SANUTO, XXIII., 268, 269, 287. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 245, 250. M. Giorgi in ALBÈRI, II., 3, 46. Cf. PIEPER, 57, A. 4.

§ *Iacopo Salviato mercatori Florentino ut accomodet pecunias ex cruciata provenientes regi Franciae; according to the original order the money was to be raised for the Crusade: "cum id. rex ad nos scripserit sperare se cum Helvetiis et aliis principib. christianis bonam pacem et concordiae conclusionem initurum persoluta tamen certa pecuniae summa sed eam non sine maximo subditor, suorum incommodo ad praesans erogare posse eapropter," the free disposal will be granted. Dat. Dec. 17, 1516. Arm. XXXIX., f. XXXI. n. 112. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

the agreement was delayed. The Ambassador observed on this occasion how anxious the idea of the Treaty of Cambrai made the Pope.* On the top of this came disturbing news about the Turks.† Thus did the year 1516 come to a close, full of grave anxiety for the Pope; the new year brought with it the alarming tidings of a menace to the scarcely won Duchy of Urbino.

Francesco Maria had not remained inactive during his exile at Mantua, and had been turning in every direction for help.‡ It was easy for him to gain the friendship of Federigo Gonzaga, Lord of Bozzoli, who was as jealous as he of Lorenzo de' Medici; but what was more important was that he could count on the assistance of the French viceroy of Milan, Odet de Foix, Lord of Lautrec, who hated the Pope both as an Italian and as a priest. One very favourable feature in the undertaking of Francesco Maria, was that just then a number of Spanish and German soldiers had been thrown out of employment by the peace, and were seeking everywhere for a fresh engagement. Five thousand of these now declared themselves ready to follow the discrowned Duke into his former Duchy, the inhabitants of which desired his return, being dissatisfied with the rule of Lorenzo and his exorbitant taxation. Francesco Maria left Mantua on the 16th of January with his small but enterprising army, and marched on Urbino. It was a bold venture, for he had neither money, ordnance, nor provisions of war; however, it was soon to be seen that fortune favoured him.§

The news of the rising in Urbino was to Rome like a

* SANUTO, XXIII., 437. Cf. 288.

† Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 250.

‡ Cf. VERDI, 39.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1; VETTORI, 321 *seq.*; BALAN, Boschetti, I., 106 *seq.*, App. 77.

flash of lightning in a cloudless sky. At the time the Pope was deeply engaged in discussing the Turkish question with the Cardinals, and did not dream of such a thing as a menace to Urbino. All were taken completely by surprise; and the Duke was in the Romagna before it was known that he had moved. The Pope was quite unprepared for war, because, owing to his lavish generosity, added to his bad management, money, the one thing necessary, was wanting to him. The Papal officers were discontented, because they did not receive sufficient pay; they were, moreover, deeply in debt, for all men followed the Pope's example in lavishness. Therefore the war had to be started with borrowed money—a doubtful proceeding for any prince.*

From the first the Pope had no doubt whatever that France and Venice had a hand in the Duke's attempt. Neither of them, said he, on the 26th of January, 1517, to the Venetian Ambassador, had any reason to support Francesco Maria against him. Two days later, however, the Ambassador of the Republic was able to give him the assurance that his Government would not assist any enemy of the Pope.† The French also loudly protested their innocence, but the Pope believed them so little that he had no hesitation in expressing his distrust of Francis I., even in the letters in which he begged for the help of Germany and Spain. Even in a letter to Francis himself he expressed his distrust of his intentions.‡

* VETTORI, 322. Cf. SANUTO, XXIII., 552-553, 554; and Abschiede, III., 2, 1047. See also VERDI, 41.

† Cf. SANUTO, XXIII., 552-553. Cf. 584.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1; RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 82, 83. Cf. BUDDEE, 17. The French Nuncio, Canossa, was in a very difficult position when Francis I. chose to renew his demand for the cession of Modena and Reggio to the Duke of Ferrara, who urged the

The Pope's position was desperate, for, thanks to his habitual tactics, he was in a state of dangerous isolation. Not only Francis, but Maximilian also owed him a grudge. Still angry at what he considered the too friendly terms of Leo with France in the spring of 1516, the Emperor wrote a very bitter letter to the Pope on the 20th of February, 1517.* Internal difficulties were added to those from outside. The Romagna was discontented with the bad government of the Papal representative, Florence was in a state of disturbance, and the troops were clamouring for pay. To all this was added the anxiety about the Cambrai Congress, to prevent which Nicholas von Schönberg was sent at the beginning of January. "The union of the three sovereigns," said the Pope to the Venetian Ambassador, "portends the division of Italy, to your injury and our own."†

Lorenzo de' Medici, who left Rome on the 18th of matter warmly. (*Cf.* the characteristic **Reports of Fabrizio to Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Feb. 16 and 19, 1516; State Archives, Florence.) Leo replied that he had promised this, and would keep his word if the French King on his side would keep his. In order to obtain assistance, Leo X. made a promise to give up the above-mentioned towns seven months after the overthrow of Francesco Maria. If, he added, France did what she could, the overthrow of Francesco Maria would be accomplished in a month. *Manosc. Torrig.*, XX., 385-387. The *Brief of Leo. X. to Francis I., composed by Bembo, in which the Pope makes the promise relating to Modena and Reggio, dat. April 27, 1517, in *Arm.* XVI., Caps. 9, Secret Archives of the Vatican. *Cf.* CHIESI, 487.

* VOLTELINI, 575.

† SANUTO, XXIII., 570-571; *cf.* 502. RYMER, VI., 1, 129; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1; VERDI, 37 *seq.*, 62; BUDDEE, 14 *seq.* The presumption here expressed, that Schönberg would be able to pacify Francis as to his mission, was stated in the *Brief (given in Appendix 16), to the French King, Jan. 4, 1517. National Archives, Paris.

January,* was given the supreme command of the Papal troops; being inexperienced in warfare, the Pope sent with him as advisers Renzo Orsini, Giulio Vitelli, and Guido Rangoni.† The Pope appealed on all sides for assistance. At Forlì, Faenza, and Ravenna the troops were in want of the necessities of life.‡

On the 4th of February it was stated in Rome that Francesco Maria had reoccupied Urbino. The news was premature, but on the 8th of February there was no longer room to doubt the loss of the capital of the Duchy.§ In spite of the Papal prohibition, Alfonso of Ferrara had given Francesco Maria a free passage through his state,|| which greatly incensed the Pope, who had just pronounced an interdict on the dispossessed Duke. An Ambassador to whom we owe this adds these words: "There is no money; Leo is displeased with Renzo Orsini, and Renzo with him; the Romans are rejoicing over the bad turn affairs have taken."¶ The whole Duchy of Urbino, with

* Cf. *Letter of Gabbioneta, dat. Rome, Jan. 19, 1517; Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. On Jan. 18 the order was sent to Bologna to be in readiness in case Francesco Maria della Rovere "iniquitatis filius, olim Urbini dux," should attack Bolognese territory. On Jan. 23, 1517, Leo X. praised the fidelity of the Bolognese. Both *Briefs in State Archives, Bologna, Q. 5.

† Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1; Manosc. Torrig., XX., 369. Cf. Quellen und Forschungen des preuss. Instituts, VI., 99 seq., about the pay of the troops.

‡ Cf. the *Letters to Lorenzo of Feb. 1 and 2, 1517, in Carte Stroz., VIII., State Archives, Florence.

§ BALAN, Boschetti, I., 109. A *notification from Lorenzo de' Medici, dat. Feb. 7, 1517, of the loss of Urbino, in Carte Stroz., VIII., State Archives, Florence.

|| Cf. VERDI, 45. The *Brief which contains the prohibition of the passage is dated Jan. 16, 1517. The original is in the State Archives, Modena.

¶ SANUTO, XXIII. 572, 585. About the interdict, see Bull. congr.

the exception of the fortress of San Leo, followed the example of the capital. Only the towns of Pesaro, Sinigaglia, Gradara, and Mondaino, which did not belong to the Duchy, remained to Lorenzo. On the 26th of March, 1517, he was wounded at the siege of Mondolfo. He left the theatre of war, and remained at a distance, even after his recovery, in spite of the express command to return sent to him by the Pope.* Cardinal Bibbiena, who was sent to the army, vainly tried to reduce to order the quarrelsome mercenaries.† The Pope was beside himself; he dreaded the idea of a revolution, and it seemed to him a disgrace for the Church that a "petty duke" could dare so much. His anxiety was increased by the growing danger from the Turks, as well as by the Treaty of Cambrai. He knew well that a partition of Italy was contemplated by the parties to that treaty, and that

S. Salvatoris, I., 130. About the opposition of the Romans, *cf.* TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. Cod. G., II., 38, f. 75*b*. Chigi Library, Rome.

* VERDI, 66 *seq.*, 77; NITTI, 78 *seq.* At first it was reported that Lorenzo was dead; see TIZIO, *Hist. Senen. Cod. G., II., 38, f. 83*b*. Chigi Library, Rome.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 3. The Diaries of SANUTO, XXIII. and XXIV., give many new details about the war. See also BALAN, Boschetti, I., 112 *seq.*; and Arch. stor. Ital., XVI., 2, 600 *seq.* See in SANUTO, XXIV., 149, 168, 180, 247, for the further details about Bibbiena's mission. *Cf.* BANDINI, Bibbiena, 29 *seq.*; LEONI, II., 198 *seqq.*; UGOLINI, II., 207; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., 35 *seq.*; CAPPONI, Firenze, III., 140 *seq.*; LUZIO-RENIER, Mantova e Urbino, 337 *seq.*; Bollett. p. l'Umbria, I., 93 *seqq.*; BALAN, VI., 11 *seq.*; A. LONGHI, Tre lettere ined. d. Card. B. Bibbiena (*Nozze-Publ.*, Firenze, 1889). BARGILLI, Una disfida storica e i discorsi milit. del duca d'Urbino, in Riv. milit. XLVII., 2 (1902). See, further, Appendix, No. 18; *Letter of Gabbioneta, April 1, 1517 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); a collection of documents from the Buondelmonte Archives, Florence, about the war of Urbino, in *Cod. 1476 of the Trivulziana Library at Milan.

Maximilian coveted Florence.* But on the top of all this there came an event which might have frightened a less timid man—namely, the discovery of a plot of Cardinal Petrucci against the Pope's life.†

Alfonso Petrucci was one of those very worldly princes of the Church, whose only desire was to accumulate riches and indulge in the enjoyment of life. He and the younger Cardinals, after they had secured the election of Leo X., put forward such exorbitant claims that the granting of them was an impossibility.‡ Even later in his pontificate, impoverished as he was by his lavish generosity, the Pope was not in a position to satisfy the countless demands of those who had elected him Pope.§ Additional cause of discontent was given to these Cardinals (many of whom regarded themselves as sharers in the Papal power) by the setting aside of the election capitulation,|| by the severity of Leo X. to Cardinal Sanseverino,¶ and by the unfortunate war in Urbino.

* M. Giorgi in ALBÈRI, II., 3, 47 *seq.*; and SANUTO, XXIII., 591; XXIV., 88 *seq.*, 103. Cf. LANZ, *Einleitung*, 186; ULMANN, II., 691–692.

† Though the plot proceeded from the Cardinal of Siena, it is incorrect to speak of it, as Höfler does, as a conspiracy among the “Tuscan Cardinals.”

‡ *Supra*, p. 33.

§ Cf. JOVIUS, *Vita*, I. 4.

|| *Supra*, p. 21.

¶ About this, Paris de Grassis writes as follows: *1515, die lunae 25 (Iunii) card. Sanseverinus fuit ad papam vocatus, eo quia nonnulli eius staferii certum custodem carceris apud turrin de Sabellis interfecerunt, et quia eos papa habere volebat, et non habuit, quia aufugerunt de mandato praedicti cardinalis, ideo fuit in palatio detentus idem cardinalis et in castrum s. Angeli missus. Die sequenti papa fecit cardinales omnes vocari ad congregationem propter hanc causam, et cum intellexisset cardinalem praedictum non esse in culpa, partimque a cardinalibus de gratia petatum esse ut relaxaretur, sic eodem die

Alfonso Petrucci had, moreover, a special cause of anger with the Pope. In March, 1516, his brother, Borghese Petrucci, was, with the co-operation of Leo, banished from the government of Siena, being replaced by the Castellan of St. Angelo, Raffaello Petrucci;* it was in vain that at the last moment Cardinal Petrucci tried by force of arms to put a stop to this revolution, which was gravely detrimental to his interests. Henceforward, his only thought was how to take vengeance on the "ungrateful Pope." Consumed by an insane hatred, he meditated an attack on Leo, either when he was out hunting, or at some other convenient opportunity, when he intended to murder him with his own hand. It was the difficulty and danger of such a deed, says Guicciardini, which kept him from carrying out the project, rather than the scandal which would have filled all Christendom with horror, had a Cardinal stained his hands with the Pope's blood.†

During the war of Urbino, Petrucci bethought him of another plan for the attainment of his object. He planned a conspiracy, which was to break out as soon as he had succeeded in getting rid of the Pope by means of poison.‡ To obtain this immediate end he bribed Battista da Vercelli to help him in his crime. This man, a doctor of some renown, was to come from Florence to Rome, ostensibly to treat the Pope for fistula, and was then to take his opportunity of administering poison. The plot, however, failed; for, however highly the skill of Battista might be recommended, the Pope was unwilling to trust

fu it relaxatus. *Diarium, Rossiana Library, Vienna, and Secret Archives of the Vatican. About this occurrence see SANUTO, XX., 353, and the Diary in Mél. d'arch., XXII., 279.

* *Supra*, 159, note.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. Cf. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4.

‡ See PECCI, Storia di Siena, II., 55-60 *seq.*

himself to the hands of a perfect stranger.* But this check did not make Petrucci relinquish his plan, though the unexpected obstruction made the hot-headed young man neglect all caution. He wished—so he was heard to declare—to become the liberator of the despised and enslaved College of Cardinals, and to be instrumental in raising to the supreme pontificate one of the older Cardinals, who would be grateful to his electors.† These rash words caused Petrucci to fall under suspicion. He therefore left Rome, where he was not safe, and retired to a place belonging to the Colonna in Latium, without first taking leave of the Pope. He conspired so openly with his brother, who was living in Naples, that the Pope thought it best to write to him with his own hand, in March, 1517, warning him against trying to stir up a revolution in Siena; otherwise his action might be construed into a conspiracy against the Pope himself.‡ In spite of this very distinct warning, Petrucci continued his machinations, and through Lattanzio Petrucci indulged in very doubtful dealings with Francesco Maria della Rovere.§ This added to the suspicion in which the Cardinal was held, and still more did the frequent correspondence which he carried on with his secretary and steward, Marc Antonio Nino, who had remained in Rome. In these letters the subject was revived of calling in Battista da Vercelli to attend to the Pope's open wound.

* JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. Battista da Vercelli gave out that he possessed a secret cure for the disease. See GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 210, n. 2; and LUZIO, in the *Giorn. d. Lett.*, V., 411.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 13.

‡ BEMBI, *Epist.*, XIV., 25; RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 90. Cf. Appendix, No. 17, for the *Brief to Prospero Colonna, March 12, 1517, Colonna Archives, Rome.

§ Manosc. Torrig., XX., 393.

Petrucci was staying then at Genazzano, and while he was there Nino wrote to him in cipher, saying that Battista was as ready as ever to serve him, and hoped to gain access to His Holiness by means of Serapica and Giulio de' Bianchi, two of the Pope's confidential attendants. In order not to arouse suspicion, Battista did not think it wise to visit the Cardinal in person, but would as to that do exactly what Petrucci wished.* This letter was intercepted, and led to the discovery of the plot.

Prompt and decisive measures were taken against the offenders. Petrucci's confidant, Marc Antonio Nino, was arrested at once, on the 21st of April, 1517, and put to the torture.† But nothing was made known publicly, and even the best-informed diplomatists knew nothing more than that Cardinal Petrucci was gravely implicated by Nino's admissions. Some suspected that the offence under consideration was an attempt against Siena; while others suspected an understanding with Francesco Maria della Rovere,‡

* These important letters are to be found in a *Letter of B. Costabili, dat. Rome, 1517, June 24. See Appendix, No. 27. State Archives, Modena.

† This must have taken place a little sooner, as the Venetian Ambassador (SANUTO, XXIV., 195) told B. Costabili about the matter in a *Letter of April 24, 1517. State Archives, Modena.

‡ *La S^{ta} di N^{ro} Sig^{re} ha facto pigliare el maestro di casa del card. di Siena apresso del quale se sono trovate lettere, le quale insieme cum la confessione de epso maestro di casa gravano multo il predicto S^{re} Cardenale, ma non si puo intendere il particolare et alcuni dicono che lo haveva intelligentia in Siena et alcuni altri dicono che l'havea ancor col S. F[rancesco] M[aria] et che impero N^{ro} S^{re} pensa privarlo del cardinalato tanquam pro crimine laesae Maiestatis, ma vero é che qui si fanno fanti et dicesse che seranno 1500 et se mandano a Siena col predicto S. Troilo Savelli. *Letter of B. Costabili to Alf. of Ferrara, dat. Rome, 1517, April 21. This letter, given in part by BALAN, Boschetti, lib. 126, which gives the earliest news of the conspiracy, wrongly placed by most in May, is to be found in the State Archives, Modena.

with whom Borghese Petrucci was staying.* Battista da Vercelli's movements in Florence were constantly watched.† Cardinal Petrucci was promised the restoration of his rights in Siena, on condition that he came in person to Rome. The Cardinal hesitated to do this, though he had no suspicion that his correspondence with Nino had been discovered. All his fear was on account of his intrigues with Francesco Maria della Rovere.‡ But so far as those intrigues were concerned, Leo gave him a free safe-conduct, assuring the Spanish Ambassador at the same time that he would keep his word. Therefore Petrucci came to Rome on the 18th of May. On the following day, hardly had he, in the company of his intimate friend, Cardinal Sauli, entered the Pope's antechamber, before both of them were arrested and taken to the Castle of St. Angelo.§

In a Consistory called without delay, the Pope informed the Cardinals of what had occurred, and of the introduction of proceedings against Petrucci and Sauli. It was at the same time decided that the minutes of the trial should be submitted for judgment to a special commission composed of Cardinals Remolino, Accolti and Farnese, and that the final sentence should be pronounced by

* SANUTO, XXIII., 583 *seq.*

† JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4.

‡ Manosc. Torrig. XXVI., 403.

§ Cf. the letter to Canossa of May 19, 1517, in Manosc. Torrig., XX., 393 *seq.*, where the 18th of May is given as the day of Petrucci's arrest. See, further, Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 92 (*cf.* DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 461); SANUTO, XXIV., 288; JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; and the *Letter of B. Costabili to Alf. of Ferrara, dat. Rome, 1517, May 19. *Scrivendo questo è venuta nova che essendo venuto el card. de Siena a pallacio lo è stato detenuto et poi mandato in castello. State Archives, Modena. See also GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3.

the Cardinals.* On the same day special Briefs were sent to the more important princes, telling them that Cardinals Petrucci and Sauli had been arrested on the charge of a secret conspiracy against the life of the Pope, and that on account of this crime a judicial process would be instituted against them.†

In Rome this event, which gives us a deeper insight than can anything else into the intense corruption of the highest ecclesiastical body, caused a great sensation. The wildest rumours floated about the city, and it was said that other Cardinals had also been arrested.‡ The excitement increased when it was seen that the Vatican was closely guarded and that troops had been brought into Rome.§

Among the Ambassadors who had been informed of the proceedings, the representative of Spain openly protested against the arrest of Petrucci. He had, said he, gone surety for him, and this was the same thing as if the King had done so. But Leo X. replied that even the most comprehensive safe-conduct could be no protection for one who had intended to take his sovereign's life by poison, unless this horrible crime had been expressly mentioned.|| As Petrucci's safe-conduct only referred to his dealings with Francesco Maria della Rovere, the Spanish Ambassador soon withdrew his protest.¶ But even among the Cardinals

* In Paris de Grassis, *loc. cit.*, see the Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), Appendix, No. 20.

† See BEMBI, Epist., XV., 23; RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 91; RYMER, VI., 1, 134; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 448; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VIII., 98. Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 288, 289.

‡ Second *Letter of B. Costabili to Alfonso of Ferrara, dat. Rome, 1517, May 19. State Archives, Modena.

§ SANUTO, XXIV., 288, 321.

|| *Ibid.*, XXIV., 289; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3; Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 47.

¶ Manosc. Torrig., XX., 394-395.

there were several who were indignant with the Pope for confining Petrucci and Sauli in the lowest dungeon of St. Angelo, which went by the name of "Marocco."* Leo tried to conceal his alarm, and insisted on no one visiting the prisoners; nevertheless, at the express request of the College of Cardinals, he allowed a servant to each of them.†

The management of the judicial process against the prisoners was confided to the procurator-fiscal, Mario de Perusco, a native of Rome, and auditor to the Governor of the city.‡ In the first instance the inquiry was confined to proving whether the murder of the Pope had been actually intended.§ Word was sent to Florence to arrest Battista da Vercelli and bring him to Rome; other suspected persons, including a servant of Petrucci's named Poco-intesta, were also arrested. All these were put to the torture, but whether the rack was applied to the Cardinals is uncertain.||

* SANUTO, XXIV., 449, 464. JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4. "In carcere Marrochii" is how TIZIO (*Hist. Senen., Cod. G., II., 38, f. 97, Chigi Library, Rome) describes the dungeon of St. Angelo.

† *Die sequenti (May 20) episcopum Salutiarum (G. Tornabuoni) affinem suum in castello deputavit commissarium, ut custodiret, ne quis ad eos accederet neque alloqueretur, et cuique eorum (Petrucci and Sauli) assignavit unum domesticum eorum quem quisque vellet, dummodo non exiret neque alloqueretur neque aliquem videret nisi deputatos, et haec facta sunt ipso pontifice monstrante in publicis actibus se parum de talibus curare. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium*, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, n. 93.

‡ Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 419; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3.

§ Manoscr. Torrig., XX., 395.

|| Speaking to the Ambassadors, Leo X. denied that the prisoners had been racked (SANUTO, 323-324), yet the fact is affirmed by SANUTO, XXIV., 321, and also by B. Costabili in his Letter of June 10, 1517; see Appendix, No. 26. (State Archives, Modena). But in the Report of the Portuguese Ambassador it is expressly stated that

Another Consistory was called on the 29th of May. At this was made known the report of Cardinals Remolino, Accolti, and Farnese, to whom had been confided the supervision of the proceedings. The sentence of these was that the accused Cardinals should be kept under arrest as long as they were not cleared of the accusations brought against them. When the Cardinals were assembled in the Vatican, Paris de Grassis says that Leo sent for Cardinal Accolti. "He remained for over an hour in the Pope's room," says the Master of Ceremonies. "As we could not understand what such a long interview portended, I looked through the key-hole, and saw that there was a military guard in the Pope's room. I suspected at once that something terrible was about to occur, but I held my tongue. As I saw Cardinals Riario and Farnese enter the Pope's room with cheerful countenances, I concluded that he had sent for them, probably to consult with them about the nomination of new Cardinals, about which he had been speaking some days before. Hardly, however, had Cardinal Riario entered the room, than the Pope, who usually walked about between two attendants, taking slow, steady steps, hurried out of the room quite swiftly, and seemingly in a state of confusion, shutting the door behind him, so that

the prisoners were not racked: "*Forom examinados os cardeaes logo e sem nenhuão tormento confessarom.*" (Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 170.) IOANNINENSIS (Penthatheucus, 105*b*), who describes with horror the cruel punishment of the other offenders, says expressly that even in the case of Petrucci the torture was not applied. But, as JOVIUS (l. 4) says, "*Alfonsus in tormentis convincitur, Saulius tortoris aspectum vix sustinet,*" the matter remains doubtful. One of the Pope's equerries, a captain of light horse, Angelo Girolamo degli Albizzi, and a certain Paolo Gusieri, seem to have been also mixed up in the conspiracy; see SANUTO, XXIV., 762. Among those who escaped arrest by flight, TIZIO (*Hist. Senen., Cod. G., II., 38, f. 88, Chigi Library, Rome) mentions one "*Severus monachus.*"

the Cardinal was left alone with the guard. Astonished at this, and at his apparent haste, I asked the Pope what it meant, and whether he was going into the Consistory without his stole. He then asked for his stole. He was pale and very much excited, and in a harsh tone told me to dismiss the Consistory. I obeyed, but had no doubt left that Cardinal Riario had been arrested.”*

The reason of Riario's arrest soon transpired. Petrucci and Sauli had confessed that he was their fellow-conspirator. Like many others, Paris de Grassis would not believe this, and came to the conclusion that Leo was allowing himself to be influenced by feelings of personal revenge connected with the memory of the Pazzi conspiracy;† but this surmise of the Master of Ceremonies, who was always prepossessed in favour of Riario, was not confirmed by after events.‡

On the 4th of June Riario, who till that date had been detained in honourable captivity in the Vatican, was transferred to the Castle of St. Angelo. When the unfortunate man was told that this was to be done, he became paralysed with fear, and had to be carried to his prison. As the reason for this measure, Leo X. explained in Consistory that Riario would confess nothing. But in the dark dungeon of St. Angelo he soon made a full confession.§

* PARIS DE GRASSIS; see *Notices des Ms. du Roi* II. (Paris, 1789), 599; and CIACONIUS, III., 72. Cf. Appendix, No. 22; *Acta Consist. in the Consistorial Archives. See also SANUTO, XXIV., 324, and the *Report of Costabili, May 29, 1517; State Archives, Modena.

† Cf. FABRONIUS, 117.

‡ Paris de Grassis admits this in the passage “De Rev. Card. S. Giorgii decano coll.” given in Appendix, No. 39. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ SANUTO, XXIV., 353–354. Cf. Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), in Appendix, No. 23.

Another Consistory was held on the 8th of June: and then the Pope disclosed to the agitated assembly that, by the admission of the incarcerated Cardinals, two other members of the Sacred College, present at the Consistory at that moment, were involved in the conspiracy. Bitterly did Leo complain that those from whom he could have least suspected such a thing, those into whose hands he trusted his life, could be guilty of such a crime. But however pained he might be by the ingratitude of those whom he had loaded with honours and benefactions, he declared himself willing to forgive them, after the example of Him whose place he filled on earth, provided they would confess their misdeed and ask for pardon. But as, in spite of what he said, not one came forward, the Cardinals in Consistory decided that each of them in turn should go up to the Pope and make their avowal into his private ear. When it came to the turn of Cardinal Soderini to do this, he tried to avoid the occasion of avowing his guilt. This obstinacy incensed Leo X., and he told him to his face that he was one of the two culprits. Had he confessed his guilt, the Pope went on, his words would have been those of mercy, but now justice must take its course. On hearing this, Soderini, as well as Adriano Castellesi, threw themselves at the feet of the Pope, and confessing their complicity in the plot, implored his mercy. This was at once granted. The Consistory, however, imposed a fine on each of 12,500 ducats, and commanded the culprits to keep secret what had occurred. Nevertheless, the rumour of what had taken place spread like wildfire throughout Rome, taking many a distorted form as it went about.* After the long

* Besides GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3, see *Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), and PARIS DE GRASSIS (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*) in Appendix, Nos. 24 and 25. (Cf. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 48 *seq.*

and painful Consistory, the Pope received the Ambassadors of Germany, France, England, Spain, Portugal, and Venice, and informed them that the Cardinals who had been mixed up in the affair had been, with the exception of Petrucci, Sauli, and Riario, pardoned. When the English Ambassador asked him if he would not pardon all, he replied: "Those Cardinals whose guilt has since become known, we have pardoned; but against those who are now confined in the Castle, proceedings will be carried out in due accordance with the criminal law.*

On the 16th of June Petrucci's servant, Pocointesta, was hanged in the prison of Tor di Nona, on the charge of attempting to stir up a revolt in Siena.† At first an attempt was made to keep secret the alarming discoveries that came to light in the course of the examination of the prisoners, and even the best informed of the Ambassadors could learn nothing for certain. According to a cipher report of the Ferrarese Ambassador written on the 10th of June, there was a rumour that either Farnese or Paris de Grassis was equally guilty.‡ It was only on the 18th of June that it was learned that the later accusations were limited to Soderini and Adriano Castellesi.§ These last were indeed allowed to remain free, but, as mentioned already, each had to pay 12,500 ducats as the price of his liberty. When, however, this fine was doubled, they feared that they would no longer be safe in Rome. In the night of the 20th of June, Soderini sought refuge with the Colonna at Palestrina, while at the same time Cardinal Adriano Castellesi, who was by nature very timid, fled

* SANUTO, XXIV., 355.

† *Ibid.*, 401-402.

‡ See in Appendix, No. 26, the Letter of B. Costabili of June 10, 1517, State Archives, Modena.

§ * Letter of B. Costabili, June 18, 1517, State Archives, Modena.

disguised to Tivoli, passing thence, as was reported, to Naples.*

Meanwhile the greatest anxiety was felt by their friends concerning the incarcerated Cardinals, for the trial dragged on week after week, and each day brought with it fresh surmises as to the result.† True to his nature, the Pope seemed for one moment inclined to allow justice to give place to mercy.‡ But Lorenzo de' Medici and his adherents urged that the severest punishment should be inflicted, not only on the Cardinals, but on all the other offenders. To gain this object Lorenzo arrived in Rome quite unexpectedly on the 18th of June.§ Thirteen Cardinals present at that time in the Curia were summoned to a Consistory on the 22nd of June. All those called came, with the exception of Riario's relative, Leonardo Grosso della Rovere.|| In a long speech Leo X. informed the Cardinals of the result of the trial held on Petrucci, Sauli, and Riario. The accusation was one of fourfold treason. First, as the Pope pointed out, was that of binding themselves by oath, as Petrucci and Sauli had done, during the lifetime of the lawful Supreme Pontiff, to make Riario

* SANUTO, XXIV., 403, 413, 449; Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 49 *seq.*; GEBHARDT, Adrian von Corneto, 41. Cornelius de Fine in his * Diary relates in detail the circumstances of Soderini's flight. National Library, Paris.

† On the 18th of June Costabili reported as follows: * Circha li Car^h detenuti li agenti soi dicono haversene hora una calda, hora una freda et pocho sperano et se tene che N. S. vora ad ogni modo che siano condannati et privati se cussi vora la justitia poi che stia in pecto di S. S^a se la li vora restituire cum pena pecuniarum. State Archives, Modena.

‡ Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 50.

§ Cf. VERDI, 75.

|| See * Diary of a Frenchman living in Rome, Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 29, Vatican Library.

Pope; to which arrangement Riario had consented. In order to remove Leo X. and secure his death, Petrucci and Sauli had suborned Battista da Vercelli to poison the Pope, under the pretext of treating him for fistula. In this plot also Riario was involved. Lastly, Petrucci as well as Sauli had held treasonable communication with Francesco Maria della Rovere, and had thus incurred the penalties imposed by the last Bull issued. Then the minutes of the process instituted against the accused were read, as also were the confessions of the imprisoned Cardinals. It had now to be decided whether the charge of high-treason were proved, the penalty of such a crime being the loss of all possessions as well as sentence of death. The Cardinals proceeded to put the matter to the vote. All, with the exception of Grimani, admitted that Petrucci, Sauli, and Riario were without doubt guilty of fourfold treason; nevertheless, they begged the Pope to show mercy towards their brother Cardinals. Then the fiscal-advocate, Justino de Carosis, and after him the fiscal-procurator, Mario de Perusco, brought forward their motion, which was read by Pietro Bembo. Their judgment was that all three of the accused should be condemned to the loss of all their benefices and possessions, then be degraded from their dignity of the cardinalate, and finally handed over to the secular arm. At the conclusion of the Consistory the Pope spoke about the flight of Adriano Castellesi, which, he said, he had known about but would not prevent.*

Only such well-weighed entries, characterized by a truly

* Acta Consist., printed by FEA, Notizie, 84-87. Cf. CIACONIUS, III., 71, the *Report of B. Costabili, June 23, 1517 (State Archives, Modena), and Appendix, No. 36, the *deed in Secret Archives of the Vatican. I have taken the name wanting in the Acta Consist. from the list given for July 1, 1517, in *Introit. et Exit., 557 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

diplomatic brevity and reserve, do we find in the Vice-Chancellor's Consistorial Acts.* But from other impartial sources we learn that the Consistory was long and stormy. According to the Venetian Ambassador it lasted for ten, and, according to Paris de Grassis, thirteen hours. It was not only the reading of the minutes of the trial, filling several hundred pages, which took so much time ; but there were also loud and long discussions, of such a nature that those outside could overhear the Pope disputing with the Cardinals, and they with one another. There was one especially violent encounter of words between Leo X. and Cardinal Grimani.†

The passing of the sentence took the Curia by surprise. To many the clause which gave the offenders over to the secular arm seemed too hard ; for in this case it was equivalent to a sentence of death. Nevertheless it was, according to the laws of that time, the usual sentence passed on traitors, even when no attempt had been made by them against the life of their sovereign.‡

On the 25th of June all the Ambassadors then in Rome were invited to come before the Pope to hear the minutes of the trial read. "This is what we understood," reports the Venetian Ambassador, "by the letters found on Petrucci's secretary, the Cardinal's schemes with Battista da Vercelli for poisoning the Pope were discovered. Petrucci himself admitted later that, in desperation at Siena being taken out of the hands of his family, he desired to

* As to the character of this source of information, see KALKOFF'S profound and conclusive researches, *Forschungen*, 21-42. I take this opportunity of thanking the compiler for giving me access to the proof-sheets of his important work.

† Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 95 ; SANUTO, XXIV., 418.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3.

take the Pope's life, and confided his plan to Cardinals Sauli and Riario." To this the Venetian Ambassador adds: "There is no doubt as to this; yet in conducting the trial it was wrong that the accused should have been put into a position to hear the testimony of others. When this was done in the case of Riario, who would not admit the truth of any of the accusations against him, he said, on hearing the evidence of Petrucci and Sauli, that as they affirmed his connivance in the plot, this statement must be retained in the minutes. Soderini affirmed that he had promised Riario the tiara." Unfortunately this is all that the Ambassador says about the reading of the minutes of the process, which took eight hours and a half. At the end of the conference the Pope asked for Petrucci's red biretta, which was on the table in front of him. "This," said he, "is what he staked. He was determined to go to all lengths." *

There is no doubt that Leo X. believed in the existence of a real conspiracy against his life. For some time he would not venture to leave his well-guarded palace: and when at last, contrary to all expectation, he attended Vespers in the Vatican Basilica on the vigil of SS. Peter and Paul, he was surrounded by an armed guard; and all the streets round St. Peter's were held by troops.† On the 27th of June Battista da Vercelli and Marc Antonio Nino were hanged, drawn, and quartered. In accordance with the horrible criminal custom of the day, they were both severely tortured on the way to the place of execution, which was on this occasion the Piazza in front of the bridge of St. Angelo.‡ This barbarity was generally condemned.

* SANUTO, XXIV., 419.

† *Ibid.*, 374, 401, 420; and Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 51.

‡ See SANUTO, XXIV., 421; Report of the Portuguese Ambassador

The whole of Rome was waiting with anxiety to learn the sentence passed on the incarcerated Cardinals. That Petrucci's fate was sealed was inferred by the division among others of his benefices; but there seemed to be a prospect of pardon for the other two Cardinals.* As, unfortunately, the short epitome of the trial, given by the Venetian Ambassador, is all that remains to us of the acts of the process,† it is difficult, and for the most part impossible, to form an estimate of the measure of guilt or of the motives of each individual. There is, however, no doubt whatever as to the existence of treasonable dealings

in Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 471; JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., Cod. G., II., 38, f. 100b of the Chigi Library, Rome. The *Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatic. Libr.) mentions the execution of a third, Paule de Seve. A certain Paolo Agostini, who was connected with Nino, was condemned to the galleys; SANUTO, *loc. cit.* Lattanzio Petrucci, who had gone over to Francesco Maria della Rovere, lost his bishopric; see Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 58, and Manosc. Torrig., XX., 393 *seq.*

* Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 418, 421. Even on the 12th of June B. Costabili announced to Alfonso of Ferrara: *Si tiene che la cossa di S. Giorgio et del Sauli se acconciarà cum denari. State Archives, Modena.

† The archives of St. Angelo, now moved to the Secret Archives of the Vatican, are unfortunately imperfect, there being missing, among other deeds, a file of very important documents relating to the trial and conviction of the Cardinals. According to the old Indexes there were existing, in Arm. IV., caps. I., n. 79: the *Cedula sententiae Leonis X. contra card. R. Riarium, B. de Saulis, Alph. Petruccium et alios complices*, dat. 1517, Juni 22; n. 80: the *Cedula of the sentence passed on Adriano Castellesi*, dat. 1518, July 5; n. 81: *Informatio facti pro fisco contra card. Riarium, Petruccium et de Saulis ob praetensium laesae maiestatis crimen*, dat. 1517, June 22; caps. XII., n. 8: *Processus contra familiares cardinalis Petruccii*. These documents were missing in 1893; nor could they be found in spite of the renewed and thorough researches of the archives in 1905.

with Francesco Maria della Rovere, or of the plot to poison Leo X.*

There is no doubt that Petrucci was the most guilty of the conspirators, and indeed the head of the whole plot; for there is incontrovertible proof of his criminal machinations with Battista da Vercelli. The sentence of death pronounced against him was carried out at once, though the statements vary as to the mode of his execution, and whether he was strangled or beheaded.† There is also great uncertainty whether this young man, twenty-seven years of age, who had cared for nothing but the frivolous enjoyment of life,‡ reconciled his soul to God before he died.§

As regards Sauli, Riario, Soderini, and Adriano Castellesi, there seems no doubt that they gave ear more or less to

* Even RANKE (*Deutsche Geschichte*, I.², 302) states that "all possible doubts as to the reality of the conspiracy are removed in the light of the speech made by Bandinelli Sauli on the occasion of his pardon." See *infra*, p. 194.

† SANUTO, XXIV., 404; Tizio in FABRONIUS, 285; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. The Portuguese Ambassador (*Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 441), CORNELIUS DE FINE (* *Diary in the National Library, Paris*), SANUTO (XXXII., 417), and IOANNINENSIS (*Pentatheucus*, 106) say that Petrucci was strangled. The author of the **Diary in Cod. Barb.*, lat. 3552, f. 306, speak only of "de morte violente." The day of the execution, which was apparently kept very secret, varies, but apparently it was on July 4; see GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 213, n. 3. In the documentary communications of Bertolotti about the executions in the time of Leo X., in *Riv. d. discipl. carc.*, XIV., 166, mention is made that Petrucci did not die by the hand of the official executioner. This confirms the statement that the Moor, Roland, officiated in his case as executioner.

‡ See JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. 4.

§ While TIZIO (*loc. cit.*) says that Petrucci remained impenitent to the end, the **Chronicle in the Cod. Urb.*, 1641, says that he died full of contrition. Cf. CESAREO in *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, II., 15.

Petrucchi's criminal schemes, though how far each was individually involved cannot be ascertained by the material at our disposal. The historian Paolo Giovio, who is as a rule well-informed, says as follows: "Even if those above named did not actually confide the execution of the criminal scheme to the unstable and frivolous Petrucci, there is no doubt that they incited him to it by their jests and jibes. In their inmost hearts these men were devoured by hatred and ambition, and wished that Petrucci might succeed in his project of removing the Pope, either by open violence or by subtle poison." From other sources also it seems undeniable that at least Sauli and Riario had a more intimate knowledge of the murderous plot. Their crime, therefore, consisted in not revealing, as they were bound to do, the vengeful machinations of Petrucci, of which they were aware.

As to Adriano Castellesi, he was unlike the others, and Giovio declares that he did not wish for the Pope's death from any feelings of hatred or ill-will, but solely because his ambition led him to wish for the tiara for himself. Ambition, as well as hatred of the Florentine who was so all-powerful in the Curia, was an essential motive with Riario. Soderini could not forget the banishment from Florence of his brother Pietro, although Leo X. had at once invited him to Rome and had restored to him his possessions.* Next to Petrucci, there is no doubt, from the incriminating character of the letters which were seized, that Sauli was very deeply involved.† No satisfactory explanation can be given why he allowed himself to be

* JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. As to Riario's ambition and hatred of the Florentine, see Nuova Rassegna, 1894, II., 7-8; his desire for the tiara, Ariosto's third satire (in GILDEMEISTER, 29 *seq.*), which speaks openly of it. Cf. also Giorn. d. Lett. Ital., XLII., 99.

† SANUTO, XXIV., 289. Cf. *infra*, 194, Sauli's speech on Jul. 31.

mixed up in the treasonable intrigue. Few of the Cardinals had received so many benefits and favours from the Pope as he. The black ingratitude with which Sauli repaid his generosity pained the Pope deeply. "Even during the last three months," said Leo to the Venetian Ambassador, "we have conferred benefices on Sauli to the value of 6000 ducats."* In court circles the opinion was held that it was these very marks of favour, and the Pope's partiality for Sauli, which had developed in him an intolerable pride, and resentment because the Pope had given the see of Marseilles to Giulio de' Medici instead of to himself.†

Urgent appeals were sent in to the Pope from many quarters on behalf of Sauli as well as of Riario. Genoa pleaded for Sauli, as also did Cardinal Cibo, and, above all, the French King.‡ Many also interceded for Riario, among others the Venetian Ambassador. His relatives wrote in his favour even to Henry VIII. of England.§ In his justification it was pleaded that his worst crime was keeping back the incriminating confidences of Petrucci. It is, however, undeniable that he had set his hopes on obtaining the tiara, and that his confidential relations with Francesco Maria della Rovere had led him to join the mortal enemy of the Pope.||

* SANUTO, XXIV., 288.

† JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4; Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, I., 406; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3; FABRONIUS, 119; REUMONT, III., 2, 99.

‡ Cf. BIZARRI, Hist. Genuen., XIX., 448; FABRONIUS, 120; Lettere de' principi, I., 21; a letter of Francis I. to Leo X., dat. Boulogne, 1517, July 1, in which intercession was made for Sauli, was found in the Archives of St. Angelo, Arm., IV., caps. I., n. 82, but it is no longer there.

§ SANUTO, XXIV., 403; RYMER, VI., 1, 134; ROSCOE-BOSSI, VIII., 102 *seq.*

|| See SANUTO, XXIV., 354 *seq.*, 543; JOVIUS, Vita, l. 4. Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 99-100; and *subra*, p. 187.

In spite of all this, there were special reasons which induced the Pope to pardon and restore Riario. There were, however, the strictest conditions laid down for his pardon.* The first of these was that he should expressly acknowledge that he had been lawfully deposed, and that he owed his restoration solely to the mercy of His Holiness. He had, moreover, to promise solemnly that he would be henceforward the true servant of the Pope; that he would refrain from all hostility towards him and his family, and have no dealings with any prince or Cardinal except about his own private concerns. As a punishment he was to pay, in three instalments, the enormous fine of 150,000 ducats. The first instalment of 50,000 ducats was to be advanced by Agostino Chigi, and the necessary security must be offered either by bankers or friendly officials of the Curia for the punctual payment at Christmas and Easter of the remaining instalments. Futhermore, caution money of 150,000 ducats was demanded for the observance of all matters connected with obedience and fidelity, especially that which forbade him to ever leave his appointed dwelling without the written permission of the Pope. As a further precaution, the twelve Cardinals who had taken part in Riario's deposition, as well as Cardinal Leonardo Grosso della Rovere, were bound to pledge themselves to see that Riario kept his promises; failing which he was to be regarded as deposed in perpetuity. The same security was to be given by the Ambassadors of Germany, England, France, Spain, Portugal, and Venice. Their security was to be ratified within four months, and besides this they were to pledge themselves to make no further appeals to the Pope in favour of Riario.

* See Appendix, Nos. 36-37, the **Capitula et conventiones ineundae* inter S. D. N. et D. Raphaellem de Riario olim card. S. Giorgii. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

On the 17th of July, in the great hall of St. Angelo, before the fiscal-procurator, Mario de Perusco, Riario promised to faithfully observe all these conditions. On the 23rd, his nearest relatives promised to pay a fine of 75,000 ducats, should Riario leave the Vatican without the express permission of the Pope.* On the same day Agostino Chigi promised to pay the Pope 150,000 ducats on his behalf.† On receiving this promise, the Pope decreed thus in a Consistory held on July the 24th: "Riario shall be restored to his dignities, with the exception of the title of S. Lorenzo in Damaso, and without either active or passive right of voting."‡

* Cf. the deed concerning this (Secret Archives of the Vatican) in Appendix, Nos. 36-37.

† Chigi's promise has been published by FEA, *Notizie*, 83, 84. From it GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 214) assumes incorrectly that the fine had been reduced to 50,000; to prove this he also appeals to a despatch of Minio's of June 15, with which Sanuto alone can be made to agree. But this despatch proves nothing, as the final arrangement between Leo X. and Riario took place a full month later. That contemporaries, (PETR. MARTYR, *Epist.*, XXX., 596; TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.*; and CORNELIVS DE FINE, **Diary in National Library, Paris*) are correct at putting the fine at 150,000 ducats, can be seen by the **Capitula* given in Appendix, Nos. 36-37. At first even more seems to have been demanded, for B. Costabili says on June 27, 1517: **La pratica di S. Giorgio non è desperata perchè per parte di N. S. se adimanda 150^m duc. non comprehendose 19^m se sono havuti.* State Archives, Modena. But I can prove that this enormous fine was paid without any reduction. In **Introitus et Exitus*, 558, f. 108b, there is this entry: 10 febr. 1518 (st. flor.) hab. duc. centum quinquaginta milia auri de camera a rev. d. R. card. s. Georgii pro sua liberatione castri (*sic*) s. Angeli ut apparet per mandatum cam. apost. sub die XV. Ianuarii preteriti per manus Bernardi Bini. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

‡ SANUTO, XXIV., 511 *seq.*, *Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), and the Bull of July 24, 1517 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in Appendix, Nos. 35 and 38. Riario retained the position of Camerlengo only nominally, though all deeds were issued in his

The news of the approaching liberation of Riario, who was universally respected and beloved, spread rapidly through Rome. As the Master of Ceremonies, Paris de Grassis, made his way to St. Angelo to announce the good news to the prisoner, the streets were filled with a jubilant crowd. Riario was conducted to the Vatican by the covered way, in which he was met by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici. Having taken the oath required of him in the apartment of Cardinal Trivulzio, Paris de Grassis conducted him to the Pope, around whom all the Cardinals were assembled. Riario kissed Leo's foot, but the latter put out his hand in a friendly manner and embraced him. Riario began to speak, but apologized for not having been able to prepare his words. Then breaking out into vehement expressions, he acknowledged his guilt, by which, he said, he deserved not only degradation but death. He praised the mercy of the Pope, which removed all fear of future punishment, and enabled him to live in peace. "I have sinned," said he; "I have sinned far more than I admitted in my judicial confession." "Honoured Lord," replied the Pope, "what we have done by you is in accordance with our duty, and for the honour of the Apostolic See. We pardon you now for the sake of Christ, and restore you to your former state. Let all that has passed be forgotten between us." *

It is not difficult to understand what it was that moved name. Armellini received the administrative appointment on July 24, 1517; see the document in *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, I., 70. Cf. GARAMPI, App., 196. The monthly pay of Armellini as *praesidens cam. apost.* consisted of 150 duc. See *Introit. et Exit.*, 560, f. 244b, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

* See **Restitutio et excarceratio* rev. d. card. S. Georgii, in Paris de Grassis, *Diarium* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), given partly in RAVNALDUS, 1517, n. 96-97, and completely in CIACONIUS, III., 72 *seqq.*

Leo X. to pardon and restore Riario. For many years the Cardinal had held the dignity of Camerlengo of the Roman Church and Dean of the Sacred College, a member of which he had been for forty years. His riches and generosity had made him one of the most influential personalities in Rome. Had the Pope refused pardon to such a man, he would have drawn down hatred on himself from high and low. He would have also laid himself open to the suspicion of being actuated by motives of private revenge; for Riario had been a witness of the Pazzi conspiracy, in which Leo's father had been wounded and his uncle Giuliano killed. Though innocent, the Medici had arrested Riario, and only set him at liberty thanks to the energetic measures taken by Sixtus IV. on his behalf.* These measures were still so fresh in the memory of all concerned, that when Leo took proceedings against Riario for his complicity in Petrucci's attempt, even the Pope's adherents suspected that a desire for revenge for the old offence was at the bottom of the action taken by him.† However, the joy with which his pardon was greeted by his many adherents,‡ the friendliness of the Pope towards him then and afterwards,§ and even his full restoration which followed, when the right, active and passive, of voting was

* Cf. Vol. IV. of this work, 314-317.

† "Riario salutis fuit ætatis honor et veteris inimicitie respectus, ne Leo patris vulnera patruque caedem, cui Riarius interfuerat, conficto novo crimine ulcisci videretur," says JOVIUS, *Vita*, lib. 4. Cf. GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. Not only those hostile to Leo X., such as TIZIO (see GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 213), but also Paris de Grassis, who, it must be admitted, was a friend of Riario's, believed that his arrest was prompted by the spirit of private revenge. Cf. *supra*, p. 178.

‡ Cf. the *Letter of Frid. Flavius to Card. Riario, dat. Aug. 20, 1517, in which the generosity of the Pope is enthusiastically extolled. The MS. is in the Library of my friend Faloci-Pulignani at Foligno.

§ Cf. the *Report of Paris de Grassis, Appendix, No. 39.

restored to him,* could not blind him to the fact that his part in the Curia was played out. At the latter end of 1520 he asked leave to retire to Naples.† This was granted. However, the bewitching beauty of his new abode could not make up to Riario for the loss of his position in the capital of the world. He who had been so full of the enjoyment of life, who had always lived in regal splendour in the most beautiful palace in Rome, fell into a state of melancholy, and died on the 7th of July, 1521, at the age of sixty-one.‡ His body was brought to Rome and laid to rest in a very simple tomb in the Church of the Santi Apostoli.§ He required no special monument, for his magnificent palace of the Cancelleria, which he had to leave to the Apostolic Chamber, will keep the memory of this unfortunate man alive till the most remote ages.

A few days after the restoration of Riario there followed, with unexpected rapidity, that of Sauli, who was condemned to pay a fine of 25,000 ducats.|| When the Pope went into Consistory on the 31st of July, he sent Paris de Grassis to

* See SANUTO, XXVI., 358, 369, 379, 406; Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 421-423.

† In July Riario, "con licentia del papa," went to Caprarolo (*Letter of A. Germanello to the Marquis of Mantua, dat. Rome, 1520, July 7, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Having returned thence, he begged leave in October to go to Naples (SANUTO, XXIX., 306). He went there on Oct. 16 (*Diary in Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, Vatican Library) and arrived at his new abode in the beginning of November (SANUTO, *loc. cit.*, 406). See Appendix, No. 43.

‡ See TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., Cod. G. II., 39, f. 17. Chigi Library, Rome.

§ SANUTO, XXXI., 45 *seq.*, 89; Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 464-466; FORCELLA, II., 534, n. 1606; CARDELLA, III., 213; FABRONIUS, 285; CANCELLIERI, Mercato, 33; CIACONIUS, III., 75. The date of his death as put by many on July 9 is incorrect. The *Diary Cod. Barb., lat. 3552 (Vatican Library) also puts it on the 7th.

|| Cf. Arm., XXXIX., t. 39, f. 6b. Secret Archives of the Vatican.
VOL. VII.

fetch Sauli from the Castle of St. Angelo. As a sign that his mission was genuine, he gave the Master of Ceremonies his diamond ring to show to the gaoler. "When I received this," says Paris de Grassis, "I was astonished, because only a few days before the Pope had told me that he meant to treat and punish Sauli as his enemy." Sauli, however, was not allowed to appear before the Pope with his cappa, but clad as a simple priest. He also had to pledge himself to remain in the Vatican, and to confess his offence publicly in Consistory. In obedience to this command, he accused himself of conspiring with Francesco Maria della Rovere against the Pope, and of sharing in Petrucci's scheme for poisoning Leo X. He humbly prayed for pardon and absolution for this crime, and promised to be for the future the most faithful servant of His Holiness. Leo X. replied shortly and irritably that he hoped that his thoughts agreed with his words, but that he feared greatly that he would fall back into his old sins. After Sauli had again prayed for mercy and had promised fidelity to the Pope, he was reinstated in his dignity as Cardinal, though without the right, active or passive, of voting. His benefices, so far as they had not been already given away, were restored to him.* The deeply humiliated Sauli enjoyed his life as little as did

* Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 98. SANUTO, XXIV., 545, and *Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.) From these sources it can be seen that Cardella (III., 357) puts the restoration a year too late. The manner in which the Pope assured himself of the fulfilment of the pledges of Sauli and Riario is made clear in Manoscr. Torrig., XXVI., 198-199. Vettori's hostility to the Pope is betrayed by his assertion (327) that Sauli died in prison. The copy of the *Bull *Praecellens auctoritas*—possibly ante-dated—relating to the absolution and restoration of Sauli, dat. Romae, 1517, Nono Cal., Aug. (July 24), A° 5°, is in Arch. S. Angelo., Arm., VIII., caps. II., n. 4. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

Riario. He lived a retired life, and died on the 29th of March in the following year. Leo had him buried with all honours in the Church of Santa Sabina.*

Meanwhile Soderini, for whom Francis I. had interceded,† had, by the Pope's permission, gone from Palestrina to Forlì, where he possessed an estate; though he had to promise not to leave the kingdom of Naples. The Pope was quite right not to trust him, and it was not till after Leo's death that he was able to return to Rome.‡

Cardinal Adriano Castellesi found a refuge in Venice, where he arrived on the 13th of July. His flight was overhasty, for it gave Wolsey the opportunity of ruining him. Intercession was made for him from many quarters, and probably an understanding might have been arrived at, had it not been that Wolsey was bent on obtaining possession of the unfortunate man's benefices.§ For a long time Leo resisted the pressure put on him by England. Castellesi was sent for to Rome; but in spite of the safe-conduct offered, he would not go.|| This sealed his fate, and on the 5th of July, 1518, he was deprived of his dignities, the reason assigned being his complicity in Petrucci's plot, as also his refusal to obey the summons to Rome.¶ The

* Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 405-406. Cf. CARDELLA, III., 357-358. The account in Guicciardini (XIII., 3), "interpretatori forse maligni," spread abroad the report that Sauli died by poison, but was not adopted by Sanuto. See CESAREO in Nuova Rassegna, 1894, II., 16. Cf. ROSCOE-BOSSI, VI., 67.

† DESJARDINS, II., 478 *seq.* (for 1516 read 1517).

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. Manosc. Torrig., XXVI., 368 *seq.* Cf. VERDI, XIV. Over the gate to the Cardinal's country seat his arms can still be seen, with the inscription: Restitutum per R. de Soderinis card. Volaterranum, A.D. 1519.

§ GEBHARDT, Adrian von Corneto, 42 *seq.*

|| *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*, 48 *seq.*

¶ See Acta Consist. in FERRI, Mon., XXIV., XXVIII., XXIX., and

primary cause of these strong measures was the pressure from England, but they were also attributable to the Pope's fear of an alliance between Adriano and Soderini, and ensuing intrigues.* Such an idea was, however, far from Adriano's thoughts. He lived quietly and devoted to study in the Palazzo Cà Bernardo, near the Grand Canal, belonging to his friend Giacomo da Pesaro. There he remained until the death of Leo X. compelled him to go to Rome to attend the Conclave. But on his way thither the unfortunate man disappeared, leaving no trace behind him. It was supposed that he had been murdered by his servant.†

After the proceedings consequent on Petrucci's conspiracy were ended, an unusual spirit of excitement continued to prevail. It cannot be surprising that the names of other Cardinals, such for instance as Luigi d'Aragona and Cornaro, were mentioned as being connected with the plot; though, as it was proved, such a surmise was quite incorrect.‡

Early in May the news spread about Rome that it was Leo's intention to create as many as twelve new Cardinals.§

Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 417 (instead of July 6 it should be July 5). See also *Div. Cam., LXVI., f. 100 (Vendit. bonor. olim card. Adriani, 30 Aug., 1518, Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf., further, GEBHARDT, *loc. cit.*, 50 *seq.* Adriano's magnificent palace (now Palazzo Giraud-Torlonia) was given in 1519 to Card. Campeggio; see BRADY, Anglo-Roman papers, London, 1890, 39 *seq.*

* See in Appendix, No. 21, the letter of Ercole de Corte, dat. Rome, 1518, May 27. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† GEBHARDT, *loc. cit.*, 51-52. Cf. LANCIANI, I., 188.

‡ Cf. *Letter of B. Costabili of June 24, 1517, in Appendix, No. 27 (State Archives, Modena). As regards Luigi d'Aragona, see PASTOR, *Die Reise des Kard. L. d'Aragona*, 8 *seq.*

§ *Despatch of B. Costabili to Alfonso of Ferrara, dat. Rome, 1517, May 23. He says in a *Letter of June 16 that Leo intended shortly

On the 15th of June he announced this officially in Consistory.* In fact the Pope contemplated a complete renewal of the Sacred College. The recent occurrences had shown the necessary consequences of the secularization of the Supreme Senate of the Church, which had been initiated by Sixtus IV.† The moment had come for a radical reform of the College of Cardinals; but that Leo X. did not even yet fully grasp the gravity of the situation, is shown by the manner in which he proceeded. Instead of raising quite blameless men to the purple by the process of a severe selection, he chose several for the dignity solely because they were rich, and would be able to help to defray the enormous and daily growing expenses of the Urbino war.‡

When the news of all the horrible things that had been occurring in Rome reached Germany, the strongest imaginable spirit of hostility sprang up. The punishment of the criminals was condemned as unjust, and the whole procedure against them construed into a scheme for

to nominate at least twelve new Cardinals. The same thing is said by Giuliano Caprili in a *Report, dat. Rome, 1517, June 23. State Archives, Modena.

* See *Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) in Appendix, No. 23.

† See Vol. IV. of this work, 210 *seq.*, 238-240, 412-416; Vol. V., 170 *seq.*, 362 *seq.*

‡ SANUTO (XXIV., 451 *seq.*) gives a list of the sums of money paid, which, however, as SCHULTE says (I., 225), must be taken with great reservation. Some statements in Sanuto, such as that Numai paid for the dignities of the cardinalate, are self-evidently false. Cf. *infra*, p. 140. Later, extravagantly exaggerated statements, such as those made by ZIEGLER (Hist. Clementis VII., Schellhorn, II., 302), TIZIO (*Hist. Sen., Cod. G., II., 38 f., Chigi Lib., Rome), and GAMBETTI (477) are still more unreliable.

making money.* Nor was it only in Germany that the

* See the *Oratio dissuasoria* in FREHER, Script., II., Francofurti, 1637, 395. J. Ziegler in his *Historia Clementis VII.* (SCHELHORN, *Amoenit. hist. crit. et lit.*, II., 317 *seq.*) tries to make out that the conspiracy was started by Giulio de' Medici, in order to get rid of those Cardinals who were hostile to him. Contemporary sources offer no proof of this severe accusation. The great untrustworthiness of Ziegler is illustrated by the grossness of the falsehoods which he relates as truth to his readers. Giulio de' Medici wore, he declares, a mask during the judicial examination, about which not one contemporary says a word. Furthermore, Ziegler declares that Giulio de' Medici compelled Riario to resign to him the vice-chancellorship. That would have been quite impossible, from the fact that Riario never was vice-chancellor! Giulio was made vice-chancellor on the 9th of March, 1517 (see *Acta Consist.* in the Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), after the death, on March 8, of the vice-chancellor, Sisto della Rovere (Paris de Grassis and *Diary, Cod. Barb., lat. 3552, f. 27b). A still more malicious crime against historical truth is Ziegler's assertion that Sauli was executed as well as Petrucci. He is evidently so badly informed about the Cardinals' conspiracy that his statements are quite untrustworthy. It is difficult to understand how ROSCOE-HENKE (II., 338 *seq.*) can attach any importance to them. As can be seen by Ranke's review (*Deutsche Geschichte*, VI., 125) of Ziegler's *Acta paparum*, that writer believed the Pope to be Antichrist. Here, as Ranke emphatically points out, Ziegler takes fables for facts. He accuses Alexander VI. of allying himself to the devil, who carried him off bodily; and he accuses him of incest. Leo X., says he, "led a life of sensual pleasure." The whole of the *Historia Clementis VII.* is written in the same style; it is entirely *ex parte*, and often degenerates into invective. As an historical source this work must be used with only the utmost caution. The report of the Cardinals' conspiracy was written by Ziegler, avowedly under the influence of those who wished, after the death of Leo X., for a revised account of the trial. The "notary" who conducted the trial, manifestly Mario de Perusco, was arrested in February, 1522, by the order of Cardinal Soderini, the mortal enemy of Cardinal Medici. Judgment rested with Adrian VI. (*cf.* SANUTO, XXXII, 442, 443, and XXXIII., 367; BREWER, III., n. 2044); but before Soderini could avenge himself in this manner on his adversary, he himself was committed for high

Pope's conduct was censured.* In Siena, Milan, Venice, and even in Rome, there were not wanting those who were severe in their judgments.† The canon, Sigismondo Tizio, who was bitterly hostile to the Medici for other reasons also, wrote thus: "What is the use of canonical laws, established by holy Popes, forbidding priests to stain their hands with blood? for now Popes and Cardinals have become antichrists and tyrants."‡

Regardless of all these inimical opinions, Leo X. profited by the past occurrences to create a large number of Cardinals, both as a means of subjecting the Sacred College to himself, and at the same time of procuring money for the Urbino war. He forestalled the opposition of the secular powers by paying the fullest attention to their wishes. Though the College of Cardinals had been not a

treason (*cf.* Vol. IX. of this work). Mario de Perusco was murdered in Rome in August, 1522. TIZIO (*Hist. Senen., Cod. G., II., 39, f. 161^b, Chigi Library, Rome), who tells us this, adds: "Erant qui dicerent necatum Marium opera Medicis cardinalis ne revelaret que suo mandato fecerat." Ziegler most likely heard such gossip. Had there been any foundation for it, the severe Adrian VI. would certainly have intervened. About Mario de Perusco and the satire on him which appeared after the death of Leo X., *cf.* CESAREO in Nuova Rassegna, 1894, II., 18 *seqq.* Mario de Perusco, whose house was near S. Lorenzo in Damaso (see ARMELLINI, Censimento, 65), received as *procurator fiscalis* (*cf.* Regest. Leonis X., n. 1971) eight ducats per month. See *Introit. et Exit. 553 (Dec. 12, 1514, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

* Cochläus rightly takes exception at the venality of the cardinalate; see OTTO, Cochläus, 76 *seq.*

† Nonnulli etiam liberius postulabant, ut quaestioni atque iudicio reorum cardinalium senatorii ordinis duo iudices adhiberentur. . . . Alii confingi ea crimina falsoque damnari insontes viros, ut pecunia in sumptus bellicos iniquissima ratione pararetur. JOVIUS, Vita, lib. 4. *Cf.* Prato, 405, and BROSCHE, Kirchenstaat, I., 50, n. 1.

‡ Tizio in GREGOROVIVS, VIII., 216. *Cf.* ROCCA, B. Cerritanis Dialog. 65; RIEZLER, VI., 406 *seq.*, 409; LANCIANI, I., 211.

little intimidated by all that had taken place, it was not an easy matter to obtain their consent to the nominations on the gigantic scale which was proposed. The proceeding was indeed unparalleled,* and gave great umbrage to many.†

On the 26th of June there was held a stormy Consistory. Those present refused to consent to the proposed nomination of twenty-seven new Cardinals, except on the condition that the names of no more than fifteen should be published at once. When, however, it came to making a selection among the candidates, there was such a difference of opinion that the settlement of the affair had to be postponed to another Consistory.‡ But when it came to the point the Cardinals yielded to the strong will of the Pope more readily than could have been expected. On the 1st of July the great nomination took place; only, instead of twenty-seven, thirty-one Cardinals were made. The Sacred College gave its consent, not freely, but constrained by fear.§

* **Et jamais nul pape n'en fit tant pour une fois*, says the author of the *Diary in Cod. Barb.*, 3552, f. 30, Vatican Library.

† *Cf.* STRAUSS, Hutten, I., 311.

‡ *Cf.* the **Letter of B. Costabili*, dat. Rome, 1517, June 26 (State Archives, Modena); SANUTO, XXIV., 420; PARIS DE GRASSIS, **Diarium* and **Acta Consist.*, (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) in Appendix Nos. 28 and 29.

§ So says GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. Even by the 29th of June, B. Costabili knew that the resistance of the Cardinals had broken down (State Archives, Modena). About the nomination, see SANUTO, XXIV., 449, 451, 457, 460, 462, 465; PARIS DE GRASSIS, **Diarium* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), and **Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) Appendix, Nos. 30, 31, 32; **Letter of the Mantuan Ambassador*, July 1, 1517, and Cardinal Rangoni's account of his elevation to the purple, sent to the Marquis of Mantua, July 1, 1517 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). HÖFLER (Adrian VI., 68) incorrectly mentions the date of the nomination as the 25th, while GREGOROVIVS (VIII., 217) and BROSCHE (I., 50) and SCHULTE (I., 264) are equally wrong in

The unprecedented number of those nominated, the publication of whom followed in open Consistory on the 3rd of July,* made it necessary to create new titles for the Cardinals.† On the 10th of July, the Pope was in a position to announce that all the older Cardinals had agreed to the abrogation of the decree of the election capitulation which limited the total number of the members of the Sacred College to twenty-four.‡

The new Cardinals were men of very different types, by the choice of whom Leo X. wished to attain various objects.§ In the case of some, such as Louis de Bourbon, brother of the Constable, of the Portuguese Infant Alfonso, the Spaniard, Raymond de Vich, and the Venetian, Francesco Pisani, politics were the sole reason of their elevation. In the case of others the motive was to be placing it on the 26th of June. FANTUZZI (III., 151) is incorrect by placing it on the 27th.

* *Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) and Letter of the Mantuan Ambassador, July 3, 1517. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. In the **Spese di Serapica*, I., we find this entry on July 3, 1517: "duc. 17 per berrette 21 rosse per li cardinali." State Archives, Rome.

† *Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) of July 6, 1517. Two old titles, S. Matthaei in Merulana and S. Apollinaris, were revived, and ten new ones created, namely, for Cardinal-Priests, S. Ioannis ante portam Latinam, S. Caesarei, S. Agnetis in Agone, S. Laurentii in pane et perna, S. Silvestri in capite, S. Thomae in Parione, S. Pancratii, S. Bartholomaei in insula, and S. Mariae in Aracoeli (which was abolished by Clement VII. on April 17, 1527, see WADDING, XVI.², 602); and for a Cardinal-Deacon, S. Onuphrii. Cf. PHILLIPS, VI., 224 *seq.*, and also for details of the controversy as to whether the title, S. Ioannis, had not existed long before 1517. PANVINIUS (De episc. et card. titul., 20) is of opinion that all the titles mentioned, S. Matthaei excepted, were then newly created.

‡ *Acta Consist.* in Appendix, No. 34. Cf. VETTORI, 304.

§ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. As to the nominations in general, cf. CICONIUS, III., 346; and CARDELLA, IV., 14 *seqq.*, for Raymond de Vich, cf. KALKOFF, in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, IV. (1906), 224 *seq.*

found in their relationship to the house of Medici, and their readiness to advance large sums of money to the Pope.* This was how it came about that men like Ponzetti, Armellini, and Passerini received the purple.

Ferdinando Ponzetti was born in Naples, though his family came from Florence. His portrait is known to students of art in the altar-piece in the Chapel of St. Brigit in S. Maria della Pace, where Baldassare Peruzzi has represented him kneeling before the Madonna. Ponzetti had made his fortune as physician to Innocent VIII., and subsequently received distinguished offices in the Curia. On the 23rd of October Leo appointed him his treasurer; and now, at the age of eighty, he was raised to the purple. Not only was Ponzetti a physician of mark, but he was also versed in classical literature, philosophy and theology, was very ready of speech,† and was well known as an author. But all his good qualities were marred by the vilest avarice.‡ He paid 30,000 ducats for his nomination.

Francesco Armellini's reputation was even worse than his. His father was a poor merchant of Perugia, but by his own shrewdness and financial talent in discovering new sources of revenue, he made himself indispensable to the Pope; but at the same time he made himself universally hated.§

* *Cf. supra*, p. 197, n.

† "Philosophus et theologus oratorque egregius" is how he is described by FR. NOVELLUS, **Vita Leonis X.*, in *Cod. Barb.*, lat. 2273, f. 13, Vatican Library.

‡ *Cf. GARAMPI*, App. 225, 243; *MARINI*, I., 227 *seqq.*; *VITALI*, 37; *GARIMBERTI*, 477-479; *SCHULTE*, I., 108 *seq.*; *ROSSI*, Pasquinate, XLIV. *seq.*; see also the important notice on Garimberti's criticism.

§ See *SCHULTE*, I., 139 *seq.*, 233; and *ROSSI*, Pasquinate, XLV., 84 *seq.*, 94. *Cf. Vol. VIII.* of this work, Chapter II. Armellini also led an immoral life: see *BASCHET* in *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 3 Series, III., 2, 114, and *CESAREO* in *Nuova Rassegna*, 1894, I., 68 *seqq.* More exact accounts of Armellini's earlier manner of life, according to documents

Silvio Passerini was not much better. This learned though self-opinionated man* had been Datary since January, 1514,† and had served the Medici with the greatest fidelity on many occasions. It was therefore easy for him to find favour with others. The list of benefices bestowed on Silvio Passerini, as is shown by the "Regest. Leonis X.," is really shocking. Among all the benefice-hunters of the court of Leo X., certainly Passerini took the first place.‡

Their kinship to the Pope was the sole reason of the nominations of Giovanni Salviati, Niccolò Ridolfi, and Luigi de' Rossi.§ The young and highly-gifted musician Ercole Rangoni,|| Bonifacio Ferreri, and Raffaello Petrucci owed their elevation to personal considerations. The last mentioned, who had formerly held the post of Governor of Siena, led an entirely secular life. His covetousness made him hated; but the two first named had the reputation of being excellent men.

in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, are given by GARAMPI, App. 236. Cf. ADINOLFI, Portica di S. Pietro, 134 *seq.*

* Cf. *FR. NOVELLUS, Vita Leonis X., *loc. cit.*

† Regest. Leonis X., n. 6155; SCHULTE, I., 264.

‡ SCHULTE, who makes the pertinent remark (I., 109) that Passerini might have filled a small archivium with his Papal diplomas, quotes only a few of the numbers in the Register of Leo X. which concerned Passerini. How far that learned man's judgment is borne out can be seen by the following list of numbers, each of which contains a proof of the Pope's favour and partiality:—38, 82, 83, 261, 318, 2066, 2091, 2373, 2603, 3097, 3552, 4339, 4474, 4945 *seqq.*, 5249, 5566, 5760 *seq.*, 5886, 6230, 6341, 6878 *seq.*, 6976, 7112, 9127, 9326 *seq.*, 9388, 10,560, 10,713, 10,793–10,796, 10,865, 10,878, 11,393, 11,408, 11,440, 11,495, 12,029, 12,067, 12,116, 12,510, 13,976, 14,318, 14,619, 14,666, 14,742, 14,914, 15,112 *seq.*, 15,422 *seq.*, 15,766, 16,348, 16,715, 16,834, 16,843.

§ For these, see Vol. VIII. of this work, Chapter IV., for Salviati, cf. GAULTHIEZ, Jean des Bandes noires, 375; P. EHRLICH, Besitz (credita libera) der familien Colonna—Barberini—Rospigliosi—Lante.

|| Cf. FR. NOVELLUS, Vita Leonis X., *loc. cit.*

A most rare event in the history of the Sacred College was the elevation to the purple on the same day of two members of one family. These were Scaramuccia Trivulzio, to whom the success of the Lateran Council owed so much, and his highly-gifted nephew Agostino. Still greater astonishment was caused by the nomination of seven members of prominent Roman families with no regard to party. By doing this Leo carried on the prudent policy of his predecessors, who wished to remove all party feeling from the Court. Whatever the motive, the Romans rejoiced and held high festival because of the honour paid to their fellow-citizens.* But Franciotto Orsini and Pompeo Colonna were totally unfitted for their high dignity, being rather condottieri than princes of the Church. Francesco Conti also lived a thoroughly worldly life. But of the four remaining nothing but good can be said. Alessandro Cesarini was remarkable for his culture, Andrea della Valle for his great prudence, while Paolo Cesi and Domenico Jacobazzi† were distinguished for their great learning.

The Roman, Domenico de Cupis, the Florentine, Niccolò Pandolfini, the Sienese, Giovanni Piccolomini,‡ the Genoese, Giambattista Pallavicini, and Lorenzo Campeggio, who belonged to a Bolognese family, were all excellent men.§ Finally, there was the Dutchman, Adrian of Utrecht, who was a man of sound learning, and a model of the priestly life, who had been recommended by Charles V. With him are worthy to be ranked the Generals of the Dominicans,

* Cf. the *Chronicle in *Varia Polit.*, L., f. 63 (Secret Archives of the Vatican) and the *Diary in *Cod. Barb.*, lat. 3552, f. 30 (Vatican Library).

† For more about these distinguished canonists, see SCHULTE, *Quellen*, II., 342 *seq.*, and especially MARINI, *Lettera*, 17 *seqq.*

‡ *FR. NOVELLUS (*Vita Leonis X.*, *loc. cit.*) calls him "Doctor egregius." Cf. *Arch. stor. Ital.*, 5 Series, XXVIII., 308-309.

§ Cf. EHSES, *Römische Documente*, XVI. *seq.*

the Franciscan Observantines, and the hermits of St. Augustine, who received the cardinalate together on the 1st of July, 1517.* It is hard to say which of these religious holds the first place.

More will be said later about the learned General of the Dominicans, Thomas de Vio (Cajetan).† Cristoforo Numai, a native of Forli, had taken the Franciscan habit early in life, and had then received the doctorate of theology in Paris. Only a few days before the 1st of July, the confidence of his brethren had placed him at the head of the most widespread of all religious orders. He was completely taken by surprise by his elevation to the purple. The Master of Ceremonies relates how the humble religious refused at first to believe the news of his elevation, and would not believe it until several successive messengers had been despatched to take him to the Vatican. When Numai at length appeared at the palace in his well-worn habit, his complete ignorance of courtly etiquette aroused astonishment in the ante-camera. "At last," relates Paris de Grassis, "I conducted him to the Pope, who had already left the Consistory. His Holiness embraced him and greeted him as Cardinal.‡

The General of the Augustinians, Egidio Canisio, known under the name of Egidius of Viterbo,§ was taken by

* A proof of the hatred borne to the religious orders is to be found in the rare sonnet given in SANUTO, XXIV., 466, which ends with these words :

Mal augurio a veder tra cardinali tanti
Tre capi d'un milion di mendicanti.

† Cf. 349 *infra* ; and Vol. VIII., chap. VI.

‡ PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in Appendix, Nos. 36 and 37.

§ Cf. PARIS DE GRASSIS, *Diarium* (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in Appendix, Nos. 30-31. See the Brief to Egidio on July 1, 1517 (Laurentian Library, Florence), in Appendix, No. 33.

surprise by the conferring of the dignity as completely as was Numai.* If ever a man deserved the red hat it was this distinguished man, who combined a classical education and general learning with a great capacity for business and a profound piety.

Egidio Canisio's versatility and mental activity were truly astounding. Not only had he made his mark as a poet, orator, philosopher, and theologian, but also as an historian and a student of oriental languages. It is a mystery how, with all this intellectual work, he found the time to effect what he did by preaching and in reforming his Order. On the top of all these occupations there came the various and difficult diplomatic missions which were confided to him by

* About Egidio Canisio, who has for long deserved to have a monograph written, *cf.*, besides CICONIUS, *loc. cit.*, FABRICIUS, *Bibl. lat.*, I., 23, and OSSINGER, *Bibl. Aug.*, 195, as well as L. GRANAË, *Oratio in funere Aeg. Canisii*, in *Anecd. litt.*, IV., 283 *seqq.*; LANTERI, *Eremiti S. August.*, Romae, 1874-1875, 2 Vols.; *Arch. Stor. Napolit.*, IX., 430 *seqq.*; FIORENTINO, *Risorg. filos. d. quattrocento*, Napoli, 1885, 251 *seqq.*; GOTHEIN, *Südtalien*, 453 *seq.*; *Histor-polit. Bl.*, LXXIX., 203; Geiger, Reuchlin and Kolde of the Augustinian Congregation, *passim*; SCHUMACHER, *Petrus Martyr*, New York, 1879, 91; PÉLISSIER in *Miscell. di studi in onore di A. Graf*, Bergamo, 1903, 789 *seqq.* About the MS. of Card. Noris here made use of, see the work of GIULIARI, *Delle emigrazioni lett. ital. ovvero di alquanti codici spariti non è molto da Verona*, Genova, 1871, which has escaped the notice of Pélissier by reason of its rarity. The writings left by Egidio are partly in Naples (whence come the letters in MARTÈNE-DURAND, *Ampl. Coll.*, III., 1234 *seq.*), partly in the Angelica Library, Rome. *Cf.* LAEMMER, *Zur Kirchengeschichte*, 64 *seq.*; NARDUCCI, *Cat. Bibl. Ang.*, 292, 316, 416 *seqq.*, and PÉLISSIER in the *Rev. d. Bibl.*, II., 228 *seqq.* In the Vatican Library I noted *Cod. Vat.*, 5808, *Aegid. Viterb. Aug. explanatio literar. hebraicar.*, *Vat.*, 5198, *Opera nonnulla cabalistica Aegid. Viterb. cardinalis interpretis*, *Vat.*, 6325, *Aeg. card. Vit. Commentationes ad mentem Platonis in magistrum sentent.* About the **Historia*, XX., *saecul.*, see Chapter XI.

both Julius II. and Leo X.* Ever since the classical discourse at the opening of the Lateran Council, urging the reformation of the Church, his name has been famous.† The calling of such a man to the Supreme Senate of the Church does great credit to Leo X.; in this way he promoted the principle of true reform as well as its execution.

If we consider the nominations of the 1st of July, 1517, it must be admitted that many, if by no means all, the new Cardinals were excellent and worthy men, who deserved well of the Church, and by means of whom the Sacred College was for the first time, after long years, restored to its regenerating influence.‡ In this respect as also in the number of nationalities represented,§ that creation of Cardinals showed a most decided advance on any other; in many ways it was an important event. Not only was the secularization of the Sacred College to a great extent checked, but the supremacy of the Papal authority over that of the Cardinals was finally confirmed. Ever since the middle of the 14th Century, the one endeavour of the Cardinals had been to cramp and circumscribe the power of the Pope;|| though, in spite of all the election capitulations, the Papacy had preserved its lawfully absolute power. All attempts to fetter the Pope by the vote of the Sacred College had failed. The last great attempt made by the Cardinals to oppose him—the Council of Pisa—had had just the contrary effect to that which had been

* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 180, Vol. VI., 271, 303, 426; and *supra*, pp. 143 and 153.

† Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 407, and *supra*, p. 10.

‡ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 764–765. Cf. the opinion of BURCKHARDT, I.⁷, 130, and MASI, I., 138.

§ HÖFLER, Adrian VI., 69 *seq.*, lays especial stress on this.

|| Cf. Vol. I. of this work, 282 *seq.*; Vol. III., 10; Vol. IV., 21 *seq.*; Vol. V., 233; Vol. VI., 211 *seq.*

intended. The schismatic Cardinals had been compelled to repudiate the Council; and, at the eleventh session of the Lateran Council, held on the 19th of December, 1516, the Bull about the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction declared that to the Pope alone belonged the right and authority to summon, prorogue, or dismiss a Council. The conspiracy of Petrucci led to a nomination of Cardinals on a scale greater than any mentioned in the annals of the Church. Ever after, the absolute supremacy of the Pope was so firmly established that the Cardinals under Leo's next successor but one, "even in the days of the greatest misfortune, when party spirit prevailed most violently," ventured on no opposition to it.*

Meanwhile the war in Urbino was going on, and sympathy with Francesco Maria was growing in Tuscany and even in some of the States of the Church. Fear and hope alternated at the Vatican; but the various projects that were made vanished, as says an Ambassador, into smoke.† There was scarcely a town in the States of the Church which did not show dangerous signs of excitement;‡ at one time Siena, Perugia, and Città di Castello were threatened with revolution.§ In June the Pope feared lest the enemy might appear before the very gates of Rome. In all haste troops were raised in the city, and the Vatican and its immediate surroundings were provided with special guards.|| Urgent appeals for assistance were sent out by the Pope on all sides, especially to Switzerland.¶

* REUMONT, III., 2, 268.

† SANUTO, XXIV., 401.

‡ Cf. VERDI, 80.

§ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1516, n. 84, 85.

|| SANUTO, XXIV., 401.

¶ See the Briefs of June 1 and 5, 1517, in *Abschiede*, III., 2, 1062; cf. 1064, 1077 *seqq.* Cf. also *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 459.

That the war, with its enormous expenses,* dragged on so long, was largely due to the attitude of the great powers, to whose interest it was that the Pope should be kept in a state of embarrassment, and compelled to seek for help. After his cause was lost, Francesco Maria disclosed the true state of affairs by making it known that Francis I. and Charles V. had not only sympathized with him, but had even persuaded him to persevere with his undertaking.† Quite in accordance with this policy were the constant offers of assistance to Leo X., which those powers vied with each other in making. But the troops promised, though always coming, never came, in spite of moving remonstrances on the part of the Pope.‡ The leaders of the mercenary troops behaved in the same way; in order to prolong their service and extort from the Pope as much money as possible, they made it their chief duty to spare the enemy and defer a settlement.§

As early as February, 1517, Leo X. had turned to England to obtain from Henry VIII. the money for his enormous war expenses; but the English King refused to help until the Pope had joined his League. Then Leo turned to France; but Francis I. demanded security for his protégé, the Duke of Ferrara, and the cession to him of Modena and Reggio. After long negotiations, the Pope

* Even on the 18th of May measures were being taken to raise money for the war (*Acta Consist. in the Consistorial Archives of the Vatican). As a consequence of this, a *Bull was issued on June 1, 1517, relating to a tithe to be levied on the Italian clergy. State Archives, Bologna, Q., lib. 13.

† SANUTO, XXIV., 699. Cf. LANZ, *Einleitung*, 192. For special information about the attitude of Francis I., see GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 1; VETTORI, 323 *seqq.*; and VERDI, 49 *seqq.*, 65 *seqq.*, 68 *seqq.*, 77 *seqq.*, 87.

‡ Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 389 *seqq.*

§ Cf. VETTORI, 323; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3.
VOL. VII.

acceded to this demand,* but his Brief contained provisos which Francis would not accept.

Meanwhile the want of money in Rome increased to such an extent that Leo declared his readiness to join the English League; whereupon Henry VIII. sent a subsidy of 50,000 ducats. The Papal plenipotentiary in London prepared a deed of alliance in the beginning of July, but Leo X., actuated by fear of France, still hesitated to take the decisive step. However, he yielded at last, and on the 11th of August he published a Brief which ratified the League between England, Spain, and the Emperor. He now received a subsidy of 100,000 ducats, to raise which he consented to the levying of a tithe on the English clergy.†

Leo was told from so many quarters of the French King's secret support of Francesco Maria, that he could no longer doubt the truth.‡ The difference between him and Francis widened every day. Canossa, who had for many years been Nuncio at the French court, was sacrificed to the situation, for Leo X. no longer trusted him, on account of the great favour in which he was held by Francis I. His successor was the Bishop of Sebenico, Giovanni Staffileo, who arrived at the French court in the middle of September, 1517.§

At this moment the war of Urbino came to an end after a duration of over eight months. Spain and France, the rival powers in Italy, and very jealous of each other, under-

* Cf. *supra*, pp. 166, 167.

† LANZ, *Einleitung*, 193 *seq.* Cf. BUDDEE, *Schönberg*, 18 *seq.*, 23 *seq.*, and VOLTELINI, 576.

‡ Cf. the despatch of Costabili in BALAN, *Boschetti*, I., 123 *seqq.*

§ Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 542 *seqq.*, 544, 571, 611. *Leo to Francis, dat. 1517, Aug. 2, Arm., XLIV., t. 5, n. 104, Secret Archives of the Vatican. The instructions to Staffileo in *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXVI., 180 *seqq.* Cf. PIEPER, 58.

took the office of mediation and arrangement of terms.* Leo X., who with good reason distrusted them both,† found himself pledged to pay all arrears to the soldiers of Francesco Maria, which amounted to more than 100,000 ducats, as well as to the granting of a full amnesty. The ex-Duke, who was absolved from all the ecclesiastical penalties which hung over him, received permission to retire to Mantua, with all his artillery, as well as with the famous library collected by Federigo of Montefeltro.‡ When he took his departure, he held out hopes to his subjects that he would come back in better days; for Francis I. had promised to help him to regain his Duchy, either when there was a vacancy in the Holy See, or whenever he had come to a rupture with Leo X.§ It was therefore an essentially insecure crown which Lorenzo de' Medici received with the Duchy of Urbino.|| The only thing gained was a suspension of arms, which would no doubt last till the Pope's death. This much was gained, but at what a cost!

Guicciardini reckons that Leo's war expenses up to that time had reached the appalling sum of 800,000 ducats. The statement made by Leo X. to the Venetian and Swiss Ambassadors agrees with this.¶ If, as it may be, this

* Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 542.

† GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3. About the remonstrance against these very unfavourable terms, see SANUTO, XXIV., 609.

‡ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3; JOVIUS, Vita, lib. 4. Cf. Manuscr. Torrig. XX., 396; SANUTO, XXV., 10, 20.

§ LANZ, Einleitung, 195.

|| Cf. MARCUCCI, Francesco Maria I. della Rovere, I., 34.

¶ GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 3; SANUTO, XXIV., (69; Eidgenöss. Abschiede, III., 2, 1078. Cf. BUONAROTTI, 3 Series, II., 86. Florence was hit very hardly by the expenses of the war (see PERRENS, III., 63), on which account Leo X. gave later to Florence from the Duchy the places of Montefeltro, Macerata, Certaldo, Sestino, and San

calculation is placed at too high a figure,* there is no doubt that from that time dates the complete ruin of the Papal finances.†

Not less disastrous was the war in its effect of promoting the spread of bandits in the States of the Church.‡ But worst of all was the injury to its moral power which the Holy See§ had sustained, in that its occupant had again entered upon the disastrous policy of Alexander VI., in spite of the noble example set by Julius II., and regardless of the crying needs of both the Church and the world, which called for something very different from the prosecution of such a war. The struggle for the possession of the Duchy had a peculiarly injurious effect on the endeavour made by the Pope to promote a Crusade, which by reason of it came to an almost complete standstill.

Leo. *Bull of July 5, 1520, State Archives, Florence. See GREGORIOVIUS, VIII., 219, n. 3.

* The "spese generali della guerra" are put by Andrea da Mosto at 334,970 ducats (QUELLEN und FORSCH. des preuss. Instit., VI., 100). The statement of Raph. Volaterr., that the war of Urbino cost 900,000 ducats, is evidently exaggerated. *Cod. Vat., 5875, f. 37, Vatican Library.

† *Qua expeditione s. pontifex omnes fere ecclesiae thesauros exhausserat, ita quod ecclesia ad inopiam redacta videretur, cuius rei maximum argumentum fuit, quod Leo X. ea tempestate a multis curialibus et banquariis in urbe magnam vim auri accomodato acceperat, ac etiam a multis suis amicis et clientelis suis acceperat accomodato officia magni valoris, ut ea venderet, inde pecunias acciperet quod ego scio in causa scientiae, et aliquos ex illis cognovi. *Diary of CORNELIUS DE FINE, National Library, Paris.

‡ Few of the Papal governors had taken such strong measures of repression as Guicciardini, who in 1516 was governor of Modena. See BROSCHE, I., 51.

§ FABRONIUS, Vita, 113, and REUMONT, III., 2, 93, rightly maintain this.

CHAPTER V.

THE POPE'S ENDEAVOURS TO PROMOTE A CRUSADE, 1517-1518.

EVER since his election to the Holy See, the Pope's mind had been preoccupied by the Eastern Question, which, by the accession to power of the warlike Sultan Selim in 1512, had become very critical. In this anxiety about the encroachments of the Turks, Leo was only following the traditions of his predecessors. The historian of the Turkish Empire has no doubt that Leo X., after his accession, had the matter of a Crusade "really and seriously at heart," and was honestly bent on making it, together with the restoration of the peace of Europe, the main object of his life. The numerous Briefs which he sent to all the Christian princes in the earlier days of his Pontificate are a proof of his intention.*

Even in the earlier sessions of the Lateran Council the Turkish Question was brought up repeatedly.† Words were followed by deeds, and remittances of money were

* With the opinion of ZINKEISEN (II., 579), *cf.* that of BUDDEE (31-32). ULMANN (II., 556) says emphatically that Leo X. had entertained the idea of a Crusade ever since 1514. About the Papal Brief, *cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 677, and GUGLIA in *Mitteil. des oesterr. Instituts*, XXI., 685. In the *Letter by which the Sacred College announced the election of Leo X. to the Christian princes, special stress was laid on the new Pope's interest in the idea of a war with Turkey. See *Acta Consist., Alexandro VI., Pio III., Iulio II., Leone X., f. 50, Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.

† *Cf.* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 563 *seq.*, 569, 587, and GUGLIA, *loc. cit.*, 682 *seq.*

sent at once to those places which were most in danger, such as Rhodes and Hungary.* Besides this, numerous privileges were granted by Rome to the King of Portugal to aid him in his fight against the infidels of Africa.† The picture of the Turkish peril drawn by the Envoys of the Polish *obedientia*, on the 13th of June, 1513, impressed Leo so painfully that he burst into tears.‡

On the 15th of July it was decided to send Cardinal Bakócz as Legate to Hungary, it being rumoured that he was to take with him large sums of money.§ Leo rejoiced when the news arrived of a victory gained over the Turks by the Hungarians, and took part personally in the thanksgiving service held at Santa Maria del Popolo.|| Unfortunately the departure of the Hungarian Cardinal was delayed till late in the autumn,¶ and his attempt to preach the Crusade in his own country was an entire

* SANUTO, XVI., 72, 129, 133, 354, 364, 415, 532, 533; RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 18.

† Especially the repeated grant of the "cruzada"; see Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 311, 347 *seq.*, 367, 412, 434.

‡ SANUTO, XVI., 384.

§ RAYNALDUS, 1513, n. 63 *seqq.*; THEINER, II., 594 *seqq.*, 608 *seqq.*, Regest. Leonis X., n. 3633, 3634, 3687-3703; FRANKNÓI, Bakócz, 137 *seq.*

|| *Die penultima Augusti, quae fuit mercurii, papa audita victoria per regem Ungariae habita contra infideles Scytas sive Turcas, nam ex eis occisi sunt II^m equites exceptis peditibus, illico heri in sero fecit signa laetitiae in castro s. Angeli cum bombardis ut moris est, deinde ipso die hodierno ivit ad ecclesiam de populo ubi missam plenam genuflexus et stolatus audivit quam dixit abbas eius cubicularius cum tribus collectis quarum prima fuit de virgine Maria . . . secunda de festo sanctorum currentium et tertia de victoria habita ut in die s. Laurentii praedicta proxima. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium*, Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.

¶ *24 Octob. 1513 Card^{lis} Strigonien. legati in Ungariam profectio et crucis susceptio; Paris de Grassis, **Diarium*. SANUTO, XVII., 266, 318; cf. Regest. Leonis X., n. 4347, 4545. Bakócz really departed only on Nov. 9, 1513. *Acta Consist.*, *loc. cit.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

failure. The Hungarian peasants took up the Cross indeed, but it was not to fight against the infidel, but against their own hated magnates. A full year passed before this state of things could be set right.*

In spite of all these mischances, the Pope, who at the beginning of 1515 had appealed to all Christian princes to help with the Crusade,† now sent the distinguished Ban of Croatia and Bishop of Veszprim, Petrus Beriszlo, to the assistance of the hard-pressed frontier cities, taking with him not only the 20,000 ducats already promised, but large contributions of grain, war material, ordnance, gunpowder, and saltpetre.‡ At Ancona a fleet was fitted out, for which Venice was by way of providing guns.§ But the Signoria, who had renewed their agreement with the Porte on the 17th of October, 1513,|| showed no desire to support the Pope's proposed Crusade. They wished rather to prevent the Pope from having at heart the interests of Christendom, and preferred his devotion to personal ambition and the renown of the house of Medici.¶ This false construction of his action was carefully disseminated by Venice, and had a very disastrous effect on the Pope's efforts** to make

* Cf. SZALAY, *Geschichte Ungarns*, III., 2, 152 *seq.* As to the consultations in Rome about the Turks, see *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 298 *seqq.*

† See *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 305 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. BEMBI, *Epist.*, X., 23; KATONA, 842 *seqq.*, *Opera hist.*, VERANCICS, II., 243; ZINKEISEN, II., 581; SZALAY, III., 1, 178. Cf. also *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 338 *seqq.*

§ BEMBI, *Epist.*, X., 25, 45.

|| CIPOLLA, 838.

¶ PARUTA, *Hist. Venet.*, II., 157-164; ZINKEISEN, II., 582.

** One of the Pope's confidants, Bald. da Pescia, wrote on the 16th of August, 1514, to Lorenzo de' Medici about the Pope's good-will: *N. S. sta benissimo Dio gratia et non fa altro che ragionare della impresa contra Turcho e dice ci vuole andare in persona. State Archives, Florence. Cf. SANUTO, XVIII., 451; XIX., 210.

peace and promote a Crusade.* As he learned to realize that nothing was to be hoped for from Venice, which had several times threatened to call in the help of the Turks,† Leo turned his thoughts from the danger threatening from Constantinople‡ to another quarter. He wanted to make the alliance with the chivalrous French King conducive to the protection of Christendom. From the assurances given at Bologna, both by Francis I. and his chancellor, Du Prat, the Pope hoped for great things from France.§

Next to Rhodes, Hungary was the place which stood in the greatest danger, and on the 17th of July Leo urged the French King most pressingly to send to Hungary at least a subsidy of money. Nothing could have been more friendly than the King's reply, nevertheless no money was sent.|| King Ladislas, in whom Leo X. had always taken a warm interest, died in March, 1516, being succeeded by his son Louis, who was still a child. To complete the difficulties, quarrels broke out among the Hungarian magnates. The Pope's anxiety in regard to Hungary increased, and on the 2nd of April, 1516, he sent thither his relative, Roberto Latino Orsini.¶ In urgent letters he pressed the Polish

* On January 8, 1516, Henry VIII. warned the Emperor against the project of a Crusade as against a visionary phantom. BREWER, II., I, n. 446.

† Cf. *supra*, 62, and SANUTO, XVIII., 423 *seq.*, 426; SZALAY, III., 2 183 *seq.*

‡ Cf. GELCICH-THALLÓCZY, *Diplomat. reipubl. Ragusinae*, Budapest, 1887, 677 *seq.*

§ Cf. Zinkeisen in RAUMER'S *Hist. Tascenbuch*, 1856, 561 *seq.*, and *supra*, p. 142.

|| CHARRIÈRE, I., 6 *seq.*, who gives us the Brief of Jan. 17, 1516. Other States also, *e.g.* Portugal, were urged to help Hungary. See *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I., 361 *seq.*

¶ For the *Documents about this mission, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, which are wanting in Theiner, see Appendix, No. 12.

King, Sigismund, the King of Portugal, and, above all, Francis I., to go to the help of the menaced country.* But even now the French King sent no money, whereas the Pope, in spite of his financial difficulties, sent to the Ban 15,000 ducats. There is no doubt that Hungary would have fallen a prey to the Turks had not the Sultan Selim, in the summer of 1516, embarked on a campaign against Syria and Egypt which engaged all his energies for two years.†

The opportunity of making an attack on Constantinople during the Sultan's absence was not made use of, for the European powers, and, unfortunately, the Pope also, were taken up for a time by their own personal interests. The project of a Crusade was made use of to cover quite other projects.‡ This was especially the case with Francis I., who had at heart other matters, especially the conquest of Naples. Even Leo X. was often turned aside from the idea of a Crusade either by the interests of the States of the Church or by those of his nephews, and especially by the war of Urbino, though it is fair to say that he never quite lost sight of it.§

Scarcely had Francesco Maria been overthrown before the question of the Crusade came once more to the front

* BEMBI, Epist., XII., 3, 24; RAYNALDUS, 1516, n. 67, 68; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 373 *seqq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 678.

† HAMMER, II., 462 *seqq.*; HERTZBURG, 669 *seq.*

‡ BUDDEE, Schönberg, 12; VOLTELINI, Bestrebungen Maximilians, 61.

§ Cf. ZINKEISEN, *loc. cit.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 678; VOLTELINI, 61. On June 25, 1516, Leo granted to the Genoese a "Cruciata pro classe paranda contra piratas infideles"; Reg. 1196, f. 34. In the *Introitus et Exitus, 555, f. 186^b, we find this entry on the 30th of August, 1516: "Solvit 5000 flor. Paulo Victorio capitaneo triremium S. D. N. et duc. 200 D. Antonio Ma. Palavicino, oratori regis Francie et duc. 3000, Thome pro stipendio triremium Januen." Secret Archives of the Vatican.

in Rome. In October, 1516, the Pope again appealed to all Christian princes, and drew attention to the war in which the Sultan Selim was entangled in Asia and Africa. No authentic information about his movements could be obtained in the West, except by Venice, which kept its knowledge to itself. But Leo made a skilful use of whatever intelligence he had received from the East to stir up the crusading zeal of the princes. "If it be true," was the gist of his representations to them, and especially to Francis I., "that the Sultan has overcome his ancient foes the Egyptians, it is time that we woke from sleep, lest we be put to the sword unawares. If it be not true, why should we not make use of this opportunity, so favourable to us, and given to us by God, to carry out His cause to a good end, and, uniting ourselves, attack the Turks, now hard-pressed and entangled in the Persian and Egyptian expeditions, and march against them under the unfurled standard of the Holy Cross?"*

Francis I. replied on the 15th of November, by an assurance of his unaltered enthusiasm for the holy cause. He urged the Pope to work for the promotion of universal peace in Europe, adding that, as soon as that had been secured, he would at once put a large army in the field and follow the Pope as his leader in the holy campaign.†

But in spite of these high-sounding assurances he was not at all pleased that Leo should have thus taken the business in hand. The secret instructions given to his Ambassador, at the Congress which had met at Cambrai in the beginning of 1517, reveal his real thoughts. In these

* CHARRIÈRE, I., 13-15; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 389 *seq.* For the discourse against the Turks pronounced before the Pope on Nov. 9, 1516, by Stefano Possidarski, sent by the Count of Corbair, see PRERADOVIČ in Bull. di archeol. dalmata, XXII. (1899), 10.

† CHARRIÈRE, I., 16-18.

he actually lays down, as a result of the victory of the Christian arms, a division of the Ottoman Empire between France, Germany, and Spain, no mention being made of the other powers, and least of all of the Pope. But Leo X. soon learned about this project through Maximilian,* and became all the more anxious to promote the universal peace of Christendom. The mission of the Dominican, Nicholas von Schönberg, was meant to serve this end.†

Meanwhile very disquieting news from the East had reached Rome. There was scarcely room to doubt that both Egypt and the Holy Land had fallen victims to the Sultan's lust of conquest.‡ During January the equipment of a fleet and the raising of a Crusade-tax were determined on. Various plans were made, and the appointment of a special Crusade-Legate was discussed. At S. Agostino, in the presence of three Cardinals, Egidio Canisio preached an impassioned sermon about the danger with which Christendom was threatened by the Sultan, to avert which the Pope hoped for great things from the Kings of France, England, and Spain, on account of the generosity belonging to their youth.§

Then the war of Urbino broke out again. The Pope, though surrounded by difficulties, did not, even at that

* CHARRIÈRE, I., 23 ; ZINKEISEN, II., 591-592.

† Cf. BUDDEE, 14 *seq.*

‡ Cf. Paris de Grassis (Dec. 27, 1516) in Appendix, No. 14. The alarm caused by this intelligence is described by Gabbioneta in his * Letter, dat. Rome, 1517, Jan. 1. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.) To this time there belongs a letter from Cairo of Dec. 1, 1516, given in the very rare pamphlet: *Tutte le cose passate in Levante tra el Sophy et gran Turcho e come el Turcho ha preso Aleppo e Damascho con Hyerusalem e tucto quel contado. s.l. et a°.*

§ Paris de Grassis (Jan. 1, 1517) in Appendix, No. 15 ; SANUTO, XXIII., 438, 441 *seq.*, 486 *seq.*

anxious time, forget the Crusade, and carried on his negotiations with the Ambassadors* and princes.† In the last session of the Lateran Council he carried, in spite of the opposition of a number of bishops, the resolution that a general Crusade should be solemnly proclaimed, and that for this end a tithe should be laid on all the clergy for three years. At the same time a Bull was published which bade all princes and lords to observe a truce for five years, under the most severe spiritual penalties.‡ Thus, by a solemn decree of the Council, the proposed Crusade became an established fact: there was no longer any question in the matter of *if* or *how* or *when*.§

Leo X. still wished to keep the conduct of the Crusade in his own hands. A congregation of experienced Cardinals was appointed to make suitable proposals both for carrying out the war and for providing the means.|| But, owing to the great pressure of the Urbino affair, nothing was

* Cf. SANUTO, XXIII., 515; XXIV., 180. See also the *Letter of the Florentines to their Ambassador in France, Jan. 30, 1517. State Archives, Florence, Carte Strozzi., 327, f. 61.

† See Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 406 *seq.*, 476 *seq.*, and the *Letter of Leo X. to Florence, Jan. 5, 1517, in MÜLLER, Documenti, 270 *seq.*, and the *Letter of the Sacred College to the Doge L. Loredano, dat. Rome, 1517, Jan. 8, in the State Archives, Venice, Collegio Sez. III. (secret), Lett. de' Cardinali, n. 5. On Jan. 16, 1517, the Sacred College sent a *Letter to Francis I. about the Turkish Question. Copy in Cod. 1888, f. 1^b *seqq.*, of the Angelica Library, Rome. Leo wrote on March 30 to the Sultan of Egypt. *Brief in Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 180. State Archives of the Vatican.

‡ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 9 *seqq.*; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 409 *seqq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 730 *seq.*; GUGLIA in Mitteil. d. oesterr. Inst., XXI., 689 *seq.*; KALKOFF, Forsch., 112.

§ Thus does ULMANN pertinently remark, II., 558.

|| SANUTO, XXIV., 195. Cf. BREWER, II., 2, n. 3165, and *Acta Consist. (April 20) in Appendix, No. 19 (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

done about it that summer.* It was only when the disastrous war was at an end, and peace restored among the Christian princes, when the differences between the Emperor and Venice, and between Henry VIII. and Francis I. about the possession of Tournai, had been arranged,† that there seemed to be once more a possibility of the Crusade being carried out. The Pope, who had been contemplating the position in the East with ever-increasing anxiety,‡ now took up the matter with decision. The affair with Francesco Maria had scarcely been arranged before Cardinal Medici declared to the Venetian Ambassador that the moment had now come when the Turks must be attacked: that the Pope was prepared in all essentials, and that a special Nuncio would be at once sent to the Signoria to demand that the Republic should join in the war against the infidel. The Ambassador, whose government was on the very best of terms with the Porte, was so startled by this declaration that he could not make any reply to it. "While awaiting special orders from Venice," he said, "I must confine myself to generalities." §

Leo X. acted wisely in turning first of all to the great sea-power, Venice, for without the co-operation of that state a combined undertaking was not to be thought of. The task of winning the Republic over to the common cause was entrusted to Altobello Averoldo, Bishop of Pola,

* It was believed, and scarcely without foundation, that the tithe was devoted to the Urbino war; SANUTO, XXIV., 561. For the attempt made at that time (May, 1517) by the Grand Master of Rhodes, Fabrizio de Carretto, to induce Francis I. to take part in the Crusade, see Rev. d. doc. hist. 1876, Juillet, Août.

† LANZ, Einleitung, 210.

‡ Cf. SANUTO, XXIV., 229, 418, 437 *seqq.*, 448, 559; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 429, 430.

§ SANUTO, XXIV., 678. Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 400.

who was in September appointed permanent Ambassador and Legate *de latere*. His distinguished qualities, added to the fact that he was a native of Brescia, seemed to fit him in an especial manner for the difficult mission.* On the 29th of October Cardinal Medici wrote to Averoldo, telling him that the Turkish Question was more than ever uppermost in the mind of the Pope; that in connection with this affair a special Ambassador had lately arrived from the French court, who had made very friendly overtures; so that even if Venice continued to hold back, the matter would at last go forward, though indeed the Pope before all things wished to ask the Signoria for advice, so valuable was their experience, as to how the undertaking had best be begun and carried out. Other Nuncios would be required who could form opinions from what was reported of the war.†

On the 4th of November Leo X. appointed a congregation, consisting of Cardinals Carvajal, Remolino, Fieschi, Grassis, Pucci, Medici, Farnese, and Cornaro. The Ambassadors of the European powers were admitted to its sittings, to which certain men versed in the concerns of the Ottoman Empire were also invited. The three Cardinals belonging to the Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian Orders, were called on to preach the Crusade.‡

* See the Brief to the Doge, composed by Bembo, and bearing the date of Sept. 11, 1517; SANUTO, XXIV., 712-714. Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XX., 398, XXVI., 362; PIEPER, 49-50; the *Bull giving faculties to Averoldo, dat. Romae, 1517, XIV Cal. Oct., in Regest. Secr., 1197, f. 212. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Manosc. Torrig., XX., 404 *segg.* Cf. 406; XXI., 189.

‡ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 113; Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 189; SANUTO, XXV., 76, 85, 90; VOLTELINI, Bestrebungen, 60, 75; BALAN, VI., 17. The *Informatione di impresa contra a Turcho data per Jano Lascari 1518 is in the Cod. Magliab.,

The deliberations began on the 6th of November, under the presidency of the Pope; all the powers were represented except Portugal and Venice. The representative of King Emanuel was excused from attending on the score of illness; but why the Venetian Ambassador was absent, says the Envoy of the Duke of Ferrara, no one knows.*

The conference was hurried on so effectually, that by the 12th of November a detailed memorandum was ready,† which is one of the most remarkable documents relating to the history of the European movement against the Ottoman Empire in the 16th Century.‡ Six principal questions were presented: (1) Should the war be undertaken? (2) Should it be a war of offence or defence? (3) What obstacles are there in the way, and how are they to be removed? (4) Should the war be conducted by all the princes, or only by some; and if so, by whom? (5) By what means should it be carried on? (6) How should it be started?

The first question was answered by the memorandum decidedly in the affirmative. As regarded the second, an offensive war was recommended. Such a course would show more courage, and would secure the advantage of an easier discovery of the enemy's weak point. In answer to the third question, seeing that the chief obstacle must

XXV., 9, 655, of the National Library, Florence. Cf. LEGRAND, I., CLXI.; VAST, Vita, II.

* *Despatch of B. Costabili, dat. Rome, 1517, Nov. 6. State Archives, Modena.

† Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1517, n. 32-54; CHARRIÈRE, I., 31-41. Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 193, XXVI., 187; Hutteni opera, ed. BOECKING, V., 146 *seq.*; GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 4.

‡ This is the opinion of ZINKEISEN, II., 594. The epitome here given of the lengthy document summarises all that is essential in it so well that I have for the most part reproduced it word for word.

come from discord among the princes of Christendom, the memorandum pointed out that this could be overcome only by the establishment of universal peace, or of a truce for so long as the Holy War lasted. If during that time quarrels arose, these must be settled by the Pope or Sacred College, or else their settlement must be postponed until the war was over. It might, on the other hand, be advisable to make a League of all the princes under the Pope—a kind of holy alliance—by which all would pledge themselves by oath to put down by force of arms those who broke the peace. To this League there might be given the name of the Brotherhood of the Holy Crusade (*Fraternitas Sanctae Cruciatæ*).

As regarded the fourth question, relating to the supreme command of the undertaking, the memorandum said that though the Emperor and the King of France, as the first and most powerful of the princes of Christendom, must certainly be at the head of the combined powers, all the others would be held bound to co-operate in the Crusade according to their strength. The fifth and sixth questions, which concerned the means and manner of carrying out the war, were considered in the memorandum to be the most important. Apart from God's help, which was to be implored without ceasing, the question resolved itself into two things, namely, money and troops.

The general war expenses were estimated at 800,000 ducats. This sum, says the optimistic memorandum, will not be very difficult to raise. In the first place, all kings and princes will contribute a goodly portion of their income, this being but just and to their own interests, seeing that it is with them that the enemy mostly concerns himself, taking but little account of the common folk. The Turks have sworn a deadly hatred against the heads of Christendom, and want their lives. Nevertheless, we do

not want to fix the amount of the portion contributed by them, for this must be left to their own prudence and generosity. Then, the clergy must be approached in like manner. All, and especially the richer monasteries and foundations should, according to the amount of their income, give a tenth, two-thirds, or even three-quarters of it for this end, limiting their private expenditure to the necessities of life, so that they may dedicate all the remainder to the holy work, for which they are mainly responsible as the possessors of the heritage of Christ. From the nobles a tenth, and from the burghers a twentieth, of their income might be asked. Finally, the people who live by the work of their hands, artisans and labourers, should each give a suitable contribution. A third of the whole sum must be raised at once for the equipment of the army, while the remainder must be in a state of readiness, to be utilized at any moment when wanted.

The strength of the army will be about 60,000 foot soldiers, 12,000 light and 4000 heavy cavalry. For the infantry, Swiss, German, Spaniards, and Bohemians would be preferred; for the light cavalry, Spaniards, Italians, Dalmatians, and Greeks; and for the heavy cavalry the best men would be found in France and Italy. It is evident that corresponding artillery must be provided. Ships could be supplied by Venice, Genoa, Naples, Provence, Spain, Portugal, and England. It must from the very beginning be a fixed rule that the war by sea be carried on in conjunction with that by land, "for the enemy has already a fleet of three hundred triremes." It would be impossible to bring an equal number against them, but the Kings of France and Spain could each certainly contribute twenty of these vessels, Genoa the same number, and Venice forty. The Pope himself, with the Cardinals, would endeavour to provide ten. A considerable number of large

vessels, even if not triremes, might be expected from France and England.

“It would be very advisable not to divide and split up the various contingents, but to try to mass them on one point, Constantinople being the objective of the attack. The road through Germany and Hungary, or that through Dalmatia and Illyria, might be taken; but the shortest and easiest method would be to assemble the troops at Ancona and Brindisi, and the fleet at Sicily, because from thence Greece and Egypt are quickly reached.” An alliance with the Shah Ismael would be considered, and the memorandum builds its hopes on an invasion of the border provinces by the Hungarians and Poles, while the main army is proceeding against Constantinople. The division of the conquered countries would be a delicate matter, to be treated carefully and prudently. About this the memorandum says: “Perhaps it will be advisable to appoint arbitrators at once for this object, who at the end of the war would give a portion to each country in proportion with the help it had afforded. This could be arranged either by the Pope and Cardinals, or else by plenipotentiaries appointed by the above-mentioned Holy Brotherhood, when it has been organized. To arrange a division before that which has to be divided is in our possession would be very unfitting. It would be better to regard all conquests as common property at first and make the division later.”*

The memorandum, which fixed nothing, but confined itself to suggestions,† was communicated by the Pope through his Nuncios to the Emperor, the Kings of France, Spain, England, Portugal, and to the Republic of Venice, with the request for their suggestions and remarks. At the same

* Cf. ZINKEISEN, *loc. cit.*, who points out that there are discrepancies in Guicciardini's explanation of the plan of war.

† There are later opinions about Lascaris, see *supra*, p. 222, n.

time Briefs were sent to the chief powers, pointing out the necessity of prompt action in regard to the Turkish danger. The greatest discretion as regarded the Turkish Ambassador and the actual state of affairs was recommended to the Nuncio at Venice.*

"Daily," wrote Cardinal Medici, November 17, 1517, to the Nuncio in Switzerland, Antonio Pucci, "does the matter of the Crusade become more burning. The more that is done about it the clearer does the necessity of action appear. Two things are now certain: that the Sultan has returned victorious to Constantinople, and that his forces by land and by sea are most powerful. The Pope is ready to do everything in his power, and is counting on the assistance of the warlike Swiss."†

This appeal to all Christian princes, on the eve of a new era, was the expression of the mediæval idea of a solidarity of all Christian States against the infidel. The sending round of the above memorandum compelled the most callous powers to take up a decided position as regarded the Eastern Question. It was with the greatest impatience that the Pope awaited the answers of the various States.

Leo X. had great expectations from the powerful French King, to whom, for the second time, the raising of a Crusade-tenth had been allowed.‡ The Pope had greater hopes of winning him over to the cause of the Crusade because he himself was on the point of complying with a project broached by Francis I. as early as the autumn of 1516. This concerned a marriage between Lorenzo de' Medici

* Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 193, 194, 197, 198, 200; Corp. Dipl. Port., I., 497 *seq.*

† Manosc. Torrig., 193 *seq.* Cf. VOLTELLINI, *Bestrebungen*, 60.

‡ *The Bull *Etsi ad amplianda ecclesiarum omnium commoda*, dat. Romae, 1517, tertio Cal. Nov. (Oct. 30) Reg. 1204, f. 79^b-81^b. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

and Madeleine de la Tour d'Auvergne, the daughter of Jean, Comte de Boulogne, related to the royal house through her mother, Catherine de Bourbon. Ever since October, 1517, negotiations about this alliance had been carried on together with those about the Crusade by Thomas de Foix, Lord of Lescun, the Bishop of St. Malo, the Papal Nuncio, Staffileo, and the Florentine Ambassador in France, Francesco Vettori.* An agreement as to this matrimonial alliance was at last arrived at,† in consequence of which the Pope's nephew at once set out for France.‡ Thus was this matter easily arranged: negotiations about the Turkish question presented greater difficulties.

First of all Francis I. put off giving any answer at all; and at the end of 1517 the Pope was still waiting vainly for the settlement of the plan propounded in the middle of November. On the 30th of December Cardinal Medici once more impressed on the French Nuncio the fact that, in view of the increasing danger from the Turks and their undoubted menace to Italy, a prompt decision was urgently necessary. Often did the Pope himself write to Francis and the other princes, offering, in the cause of the Crusade, all that he had, and even his personal co-operation, but still no decision could be arrived at. While time was being thus wasted in writing and negotiating, the Turks were devoting their

* Cf., with VETTORI (327), the Manosc. Torrig., XX., 402 *seq.*, 407, XXI., 191, 199, 201 *seq.*, 208 *seq.*, 211 *seq.*, XXVI., 189; and later PERRENS, III., 64 *seq.*, and REUMONT, Jeunesse de Catherine de Médicis, 13 *seq.*, 250 *seq.*; VOLTELINI, 576 *seq.*; VERDI, 93 *seq.* About earlier marriage arrangements for Lorenzo, see besides, VOLTELINI, *loc. cit.*; BALAN, Boschetti, I., 150. Soon after Leo's elevation to the Papal Chair, Lorenzo had urged the arrangement of an advantageous marriage. See his characteristic *Letter of Oct. 29, 1513, in Carte Strozzi, III., f. 12-13. State Archives, Florence.

† Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 218 *seq.*

‡ VERDI, 95 *seq.*

whole power to the work of arming themselves. The Pope knew that, were the enemy to choose to attack Italy or any of the Italian islands in the spring, there would be no possibility of resisting him. The Nuncios, said he, must warn, implore, and adjure the King and all persons of influence to do *something*.^{*} The answer of Francis, dated December 23, must have reached Rome soon after this. The objections he raised were chiefly on the subject of money. He agreed to the plan in general, but he wished to have the Crusade funds in his own hands, and also to receive the tithe levied for three years in advance. If this were granted, he said, he would go to the help of the Pope with 12,000 horse and 50,000 foot soldiers. To avoid confusion he recommended that the Emperor should proceed separately by land with the Germans, Hungarians, and Poles, and that Charles of Spain, with the Kings of England and Portugal, should remain with the fleet. The three divisions must be combined in their movements.[†]

The proposal of the Emperor was quite different. The detailed document which he sent at the end of the year 1517, though the language is veiled, shows clearly enough Maximilian's jealousy of the share to be taken in the undertaking by the French King. Instead of one campaign, the Emperor in his fantastic way proposed a whole series of campaigns, which were to be spread over three years. The first year, the Kings of France and England were to remain in their own countries, to preserve peace in them and see to the levying of the war tax. Meanwhile Maximilian, at the head of the German and Spanish soldiers, would, in conjunction with the King of Portugal, attack the Sultan's

^{*} Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 205 *seq.*

[†] CHARRIÈRE (I., 41-46) gives the French text of this, which is dated Dec. 16, 1517. A Latin version, with the correct date, Dec. 23, 1517, is in Cod. Vat., 3922, f. 116-118^b, Vatican Library.

possessions in the north of Africa. This campaign would be terminated in the second year by the conquest of Alexandria and Cairo, while, at the same time, Francis I. would proceed from Italy to Macedonia, and keep the coasts clear for the Crusaders on their return from Egypt. At length, in the third year, the fantastic undertaking was to be crowned by the conquest of Constantinople and European Turkey. The help of the Shah of Persia might be gained by the cession of Armenia and Karaman. The division of the booty—which reminds us of the well-known story of the skin of the bear—should be made by arbitration under the presidency of the Pope. The Emperor had peculiar ideas about how to procure the means of war. In every parish throughout Christendom, every fifty men were to supply one soldier; to procure money besides that raised by tenths and indulgences, a tax should be levied on every hearth or family.*

The most feeble of all the proposals came from the Spanish King, Charles. His idea was that the powers should at first confine themselves to the protection of the most exposed parts of Italy, such as the Marches of Ancona, Naples, and Sicily. For this object he promised the immediate service of 14,000 men.†

This difference of opinion, and the jealousy on the part of the European powers which it revealed, as well as the scarcely veiled pursuit of merely personal ends, must have deeply incensed the Pope; but still more did the

* CHARRIÈRE, I., 49-63. Cf. LANZ, *Einleitung*, 202 *seq.*; ZINKEISEN, II., 600 *seq.*; VOLTELINI, 75; and ULMANN, II., 559 *seq.*; see here for further details of Zinkeisen's incorrect date of the arbitration mission. The order in which the various opinions given in the text were offered is taken from Card. Medici's letter of Feb. 25, 1518, in *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXI., 227.

† CHARRIÈRE, I., 63, n. 1.

reserved attitude of the great sea-power of the West. In spite of the want of good-will shown from the very beginning on the part of the Venetian Ambassador and the Signoria,* Leo X. persisted in continuing to hope for better things, and a change of mind on the part of the Republic. He therefore showed every indulgence towards the condition of peace which existed between the Turks and the Signoria, in the hopes that at the given moment the latter would not fail to come to the assistance of Christendom.†

Meanwhile, most alarming intelligence continued to arrive from the East. At the end of February a boastful and menacing letter from the Sultan was received by Leo X.‡ The Pope's response took the practical form of demonstrative action by renewed preparations for the Crusade.§

On the 3rd of March solemn processions were organized to implore the help of God. At the same time the Pope determined to send four Cardinals to the principal countries of Europe as Legates *de latere*.|| Those appointed were among the leading and most gifted members of the Sacred College. Farnese was chosen to go to the imperial court, Egidio Canisio to Spain, Bibbiena to France, and Campeggio to England. In spite of his financial difficulties the Pope himself defrayed the expenses of these legations, whereas hitherto, in similar cases, the Nuncios had been authorized to pay their expenses by means of their lucrative

* The representative of Venice was expressly directed to take no part in the consultations about the Turkish war. SANUTO, XXV., 71.

† Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 202, 203, 229.

‡ SANUTO, XXV., 204, 211, 219, 266 *seq.*

§ See Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 114.

|| Acta Consist. in EHSES, Dokum., XXIII., and KALKOFF, *loc. cit.*, 114 *seq.*, as well as Paris de Grassis in RAYNALDUS, 1518, n. 37, and HOFFMANN, 402 *seq.* (where March 3 instead of March 4 should be read. The *dies mercurii* fell on the 3rd.)

faculties. Leo X. made use of this difference to give a signal proof of his disinterestedness.*

The questions and resolutions mentioned above, were the result of the consultations which the Pope had held with the special Congregation of Cardinals, consisting of thirteen members and the Ambassadors.† As well as these resolutions, there was another idea to which expression was given in a solemn Bull. In this document, dated the 6th of March, which described very impressively the effects of the Sultan's last victory and the growing danger from the Turks, the Pope urged a five years' truce between all the Christian powers, to be observed under the severest penalties of the Church. Leo X. made special reference to Innocent III., one of the greatest Pontiffs of the Middle Ages, in whose footsteps Leo declared his wish to tread, by making the settlement of all differences to depend on the Holy See.‡

While special Briefs announced all these preparations to the Christian princes, the preaching of the Crusade was begun in Rome.§ On the 12th of March the great intercessory processions were commenced in the Eternal City.||

* Cf. KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 100 *seq.*

† Cf. SANUTO, XXV., 270.

‡ The Bull *Considerantes ac animo revolventes generale Concilium*, in CHARRIÈRE, I., 63-68 (*cf.* LANZ, 204 *seq.*), sanctioned on March 10, 1518, by all the Cardinals in Consistory; see *Acta Consist.* in EHSES, *Dokum.*, XXIII. The original copy of the Bull in the State Archives, Turin.

§ Cf. *Corp. Dipl. Port.*, I *seqq.*, 7 *seqq.*

|| Cf. *Bando de le processioni*, dat. Rome, 1518, March 8, in Hutteni opera, ed. BOECKING, V., 157 *seqq.*; PARIS DE GRASSIS, **Diarium* (given only partly in RAYNALDUS, 1518, n. 41-43; *cf.* it in its complete form in Appendix, No. 40, from the Secret Archives of the Vatican), and TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.*, Cod. G., II., 38, f. 125^b, of Chigi Library, Rome. See also the **Chronicle* in, *Varia Polit.*, 4, f. 63, Secret Archives of the Vatican; about the processions, *cf.* SANUTO, XXV., 305 *seq.*, 308 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*

The shops were shut, and the streets hung with drapery and tapestry, while on all sides altars were set up. On the first day the procession went from S. Agostino to S. Maria in Aracoeli. The Confraternities of Rome, including those of Germany, took part in it, clad in their picturesque and varied habits; after them came the religious orders and the secular clergy, carrying relics, and, lastly, the household of the Pope. On the second day the procession went from S. Lorenzo to S. Maria del Popolo. In it were carried the great relics which the Eternal City claims as its own: the Heads of St. Andrew and St. Matthias, the Chair of St. Peter, the Holy Lance, the Sudarium of S. Veronica, and the large fragment of the True Cross from Santa Croce in Gerusalemme.

The procession of the third day (Sunday, March 14), which went from St. Peter's to S. Maria sopra Minerva, was followed by many Ambassadors of the spiritual and temporal courts, as well as by all the Bishops and Cardinals then in Rome, and, lastly, by the Pope himself, who walked barefoot the whole way, and repeatedly showed signs of religious emotion. High Mass was celebrated in the Church of the Minerva, after which Sadolet mounted the pulpit to preach the Holy War with Ciceronian rhetoric. Mindful of the presence of the Ambassadors, the orator did not fail to eulogize the Christian princes, whose goodwill he rated much higher than it in reality existed.

"Who," cried Sadolet, "could have the smallest doubt as to our victory when we have Maximilian as our Emperor, a general so experienced in the art of war?" In similar terms did he extol the high qualities and noble purpose of the other princes, of the Kings of France, Spain, England, Portugal, and Poland, not forgetting the two Kings, still minors, Louis of Hungary and James of Scotland, nor Christian of Denmark, about whom scarcely anything was as

yet known. He was loud in the praises of the "valiant and invincible" Swiss, as well as of the Venetians and all other princes and people who had distinguished themselves in the fight against the infidel. How could the Turk have the slightest hope of success when he contemplated the union of all the powers? "Hitherto we have been blind, aye, blind," he cried in conclusion; "we have not looked back sufficiently at what has gone before. But now the night has disappeared and the darkness is dispersed. The glow of true honour shines before our eyes, and truth is made gloriously manifest!"* Before the procession left the church Cardinal Farnese read the Papal Bull relating to the five years' truce.

Soon the Pope's commands were sent forth into all lands, to the effect that similar intercessory processions were to be organized in every country to implore the help of God for Christendom, which was so sorely imperilled.† The solemn manner in which Leo X. had introduced the Crusade, and his appeal to the great Pope whose reign had marked the zenith of the power of the Holy See in the Middle Ages, show us how high his thoughts had soared. Even as in a former age the influence of the Papacy had perhaps found its most marked expression in the Crusades, so now a "general Western undertaking, with the Pope

* SADOLETI opera, II., 257 *seqq.* Cf. ZINKEISEN, II., 602, whose version I have followed. See also MICHAUD, VI., 294 *seq.*; JOLY, 53. The discourse was printed at once: Iacobi Sadoleti episcopi Carpent. Leoni X. Pontif. Max. a secretis in promulgatione generalium induciarum oratio in beate semper virginis ad Minervas habita decimonono kl. Aprilis MDXVIII., *s.l. et a.*, 4°. On the title-page were the arms of Leo X. There is a copy in TIZIO, *Hist. Senen., Cod. G., II., 38, f. 129, Chigi Library, Rome.

† See RAYNALDUS, 1518, n. 44-50, and Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 9, 13; XXVI., 405. Chroniken der Deutschen Städte, XXIV., 107.

at its head," would not only protect Europe against her worst enemy, but would bring new glory and increased influence to the Holy See.*

The Pope's efforts to promote a Crusade have found an expression in art in the fresco of the Battle of Ostia; and the memory of these efforts inspired Raphael in his last creation, the Transfiguration.† Naturally, poets and writers made use of the theme of the Turkish war;‡ hopes were raised of winning the Pope's favour by poems and discourses on the subject. The earnestness shown by Leo in the whole matter is beyond question.§ It was by the force of his will that these extraordinary efforts were made to gather the Christian princes under the one banner of the Cross, and set them in movement against the Eastern Empire. Alas! all his efforts were shattered by the self-interest of the European powers.

Leo's most cruel disappointment came from Venice, and this in spite of his having handled the Signoria with the most delicate consideration, so as to save the Republic from the difficulties which might arise from the terms of friendship on which she was with the Sultan. He had refrained from any allusion to such terms, and had said nothing about the mission of a special Legate to Venice.|| Yet when Sadolet in the discourse mentioned above had allowed his zeal to carry him away so far as to allude to the great services rendered by Venice in the defence of Europe against the Turks, the Venetian Ambassador had

* MAURENBRECHER, *Kathol. Reformation*, 116.

† Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, Chapter V.

‡ Cf. the poem cited in TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.*, G., II, 38, f. 140^b, Chigi Library, Rome. See also Vol. VIII. of this work, Chapter III. Cf. SANTORO, M. Equicola, Chieti, 1906, 140 *seq.*

§ See NITTI, 104, 106 *seq.*

|| Manosc. Torrig., XXI., 229; cf. 235.

at once remonstrated with the Vatican, and had demanded that the passage should be omitted whenever the discourse was printed.*

Nothing is more significative of the pusillanimity of the merchants on the Adriatic than the way in which they shrank from their own great past. The prudent, calculating policy of Venice always had for its object the protection of her own immediate interests. The most stirring arguments beat in vain against this short-sighted egoism. When he was organizing the intercessory processions, the Pope had had the foresight to write to the Patriarch of Venice to propose that the same thing should be done in his diocese; for thus the Venetians were able to declare that the measure had not originated with them, but had been forced on them by the spiritual authority of the Pope. However, the processions could not be organized without the permission of the Venetian Government, and this permission was refused by the Signoria. The Pope accepted this rebuff without a word;† though he could not long deceive himself as to the real meaning of the Signoria's repeated assurances that they were ready to join in any expedition against the Turks when the matter was really started. Nor was he ignorant that, even while making these protestations, the Signoria had secretly renewed their terms of peace with the Sultan. What he probably did not know was that Venice had shamelessly betrayed the Christian cause by keeping the deadly enemy of Western civilization informed of all the preparations which were being made for the Crusade.‡

The whole matter depended on what success the Cardinal-Legates would have in Spain, France, England,

* SANUTO, XXV., 322.

† Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 13, 25.

‡ SANUTO, in LANZ, Einleitung, 204.

and Germany. Leo X. wished that the Legates should start on their mission as soon as possible, and this Farnese seemed willing to do.* But Bibbiena fell ill, and as combined action between the Legates was intended, a delay was caused.† But on the 12th of April, Bibbiena, Campeggio, and Egidio Canisio were able to appear together in Consistory, where the Pope gave them his blessing. Then, accompanied by all the members of the Sacred College, they adjourned to S. Maria del Popolo. Thence Bibbiena started for France on the 13th, Campeggio for England on the 15th, and Canisio for Spain on the 16th.‡ Cardinal Farnese wrote that he was unable to proceed on account of illness,§ and recommended that the learned Cardinal Cajetan should take his place in Germany.

* For his departure on March 28, see Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 405. Cf. DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 65-66.

† Bibbiena's credentials to the Chancellor Du Prat were made out for the 3rd of April, 1518; see CHARRIÈRE, I., 70 *seqq.* The *credentials to Duke Charles of Savoy, April 9, 1518, in the State Archives, Turin, Mazzo 19, n. 34. Also in n. 35 there is a Brief of Leo X., dated from Rome on April 10, 1518, in which it is demanded of the Duke to ratify the five years' truce.

‡ Besides SANUTO, XXV., 351, cf. Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 119, and Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 407-408. See also the *Letter of B. Costabili, dat. Rome, 1518, April 12. State Archives, Modena.

§ See Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., and PARIS DE GRASSIS, *loc. cit.* It is doubtful whether this was the real reason. KALKOFF (Forschungen, 101) surmises that the legation was very distasteful to Farnese, because the Legates were given no faculties. Lang's endeavours to be made co-Legate added considerably to this distaste. KALKOFF (105) finds a testimony to this in SANUTO, XXV., 427, in the middle of May, and therefore after the departure of Cajetan. A *Despatch of Costabili, quoted by BALAN, VI., 18, speaks of this obstacle as early as April 26, 1518. The same announces informally that Cajetan would start next in eight days. State Archives, Modena.

The latter left Rome on his mission on the 5th of May, 1518.* Besides the Cardinal-Legates, the Dominican, Nicholas von Schönberg had been entrusted with a mission to Hungary and Poland, to bring about the co-operation of those countries in the Crusade. The first thing Schönberg had to do was to try to arrange the differences between Poland and the Teutonic Order.† Later this same Envoy tried to influence the Grand Dukes of Muscovy and the Princes of Tartary.‡ Schönberg's task was not less difficult than that of the Cardinal-Legates, for each of the powers had its own personal object to gain in the undertaking of the Crusade.

Favourable news came, however, from Spain,§ where Egidio Canisio preached the Cross to vast multitudes.|| On the 3rd of August a letter from the King of Spain was communicated to the Cardinals assembled in Consistory, in which he declared his readiness to agree to the five years' truce.¶

* Cf. Acta Consist. and Paris de Grassis in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 119 *seq.*, 122 *seq.*; see here also the document concerning the equipment of Cajetan. In a *Letter dated from Rome, May 13, 1518, Card. Cajetan announces his impending journey to the Marquis of Mantua. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† BUDDEE, Schönberg, 35 *seq.*, where all details are to be found concerning the fruitless efforts of the envoy. Cf., further, JOACHIM, *Die Politik des letzten Hochmeisters in Preussen*, Albrecht von Brandenburg, Leipzig, 1892, *seqq.* UEBERSBERGER, *Oesterreich und Russland*, I., 139, 149.

‡ See Appendix, Nos. 41-42, for the two *Letters to the princes here mentioned, July 4, 1518. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

§ Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 13.

|| SANUTO, XXV., 600.

¶ Acta Consist. in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 126. Cf. the Brief to Cardinal Canisio of Aug. 24, 1518, in Sadoleti, *Epist.*, 77 *seq.*; that from Saragossa of Aug. 11, 1518, *Schreiben Karls, in *Lett. d. Princ.*, II., 66 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), in the epitome now in the *Archiv für Ref.-Gesch.*, II., 181, n. 1.

The intelligence sent by Cardinal Campeggio, who had been appointed to the court of England, was, on the other hand, most unsatisfactory ; for the attitude of Henry VIII. about the question of the Crusade had been, to say the least of it, very peculiar from the first.* He had for a long time delayed giving any answer at all, and when it was at last sent, its only object was to remove all possible doubt as to the King's intentions. Henry VIII. strongly warned the Pope to take heed that his project did not bring great danger on himself, for those on whom Leo set his hopes of peace were those who wished to draw the Pope into war. The most necessary thing of all was that he should check the King of France's great thirst for power. As to the Crusade, England would, all in good time, combine with Spain, but she must first come to an understanding with King Charles.†

It is not difficult to foresee the nature of Campeggio's reception after such preliminaries. In this Henry VIII. exceeded the worst anticipations. His minister, Cardinal Wolsey,‡ emphatically refused either to receive the Bull relating to the truce or the Legate himself ; for, said he, it was against precedent that a foreign Cardinal should exercise legatine rights in England. Campeggio could be received only on condition that all his legatine privileges were suspended, and that his authority on all matters of importance were shared with Wolsey. Consequently Campeggio, who had arrived at Boulogne at the begin-

* As soon as the news reached England that the Pope had commanded the levying of a tenth, the Papal collector there, Silvester Darius, was made to take an oath that he would send neither money nor promissory notes to Rome. RYMER, VI., I, 133.

† See the Letter of Wolsey to Gigli on Feb. 27, 1518, in MARTÈNE-DURAND, *Ampl. Coll.*, III., 1278, and LANZ, *Einleitung*, 203 *seq.*

‡ Cf. GASQUET, *Heinrich VIII. und die engl. Klöster*, I., 66 *seq.*

ning of June, had to stay there without being able to set foot in England.*

These proceedings were not the only result of Wolsey's jealousy, for the latter had been made a member of the Sacred College two years before Campeggio, and, as Chancellor, he could not tolerate the presence near him of a Cardinal-Legate.† The all-powerful minister of Henry VIII. not only desired to be appointed Legate for life in England, but wished to wrest from the hands of the Pope the office of making peace in Europe, and thus to secure to England this glorious rôle. While Campeggio was detained at Boulogne and condemned to inactivity, Wolsey was carrying on negotiations with France not only about the possession of Tournai, but about the conditions of universal peace which the Pope was about to lay down.‡

Meanwhile Cardinal Bibbiena was in France.§ His task also was beset with extraordinary difficulties, especially after the question of the imperial succession arose. It was widely believed that through the marriage of Lorenzo de' Medici and Madeleine de la Tour, which had been celebrated with great pomp at Amboise on the 28th of April,|| Francis I. had succeeded in making Leo X. a

* LANZ, *Einleitung*, 206; EHSES, *Dokum.*, XXVI. Cf. BREWER, II., 1, Introduction, CCLVII.-CCLXII.

† EHSES, *Dokum.*, XXIII.

‡ LANZ, *Einleitung*, 206-207. About Wolsey's endeavour to be appointed Legate for life, cf. *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXIII., 405.

§ As to the difficulties of his position as regarded the visitation of religious houses in France, confided to the Card. of Luxemburg, with whom Canossa had had disputes (IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 113), see Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 410-411.

|| REUMONT, *Jeunesse de Catherine de Médicis*, 26 seq. Lorenzo did not return to Florence with his bride until Sept. the 7th. Soon after this he had an interview with the Pope at Montefiascone, *loc. cit.*, 255. See also "Le feste celebrate in Firenze nel II. giorno delle nozze

willing tool of the French policy. The real fact was that, however lavishly generous Leo might be towards his nephew and his bride, he was not in the least drawn away by the marriage-contract from his own particular objects or from his policy as to the Crusade.* Lorenzo, it is true, thought otherwise, for ever since his marriage he had become quite French in his sympathies, and remained for a long time with Bibbiena in France. He adopted as his own all the French demands, quite regardless of the interests of the Pope. But Leo X. had no intention of giving France all she wanted, especially as Francis I. paid no attention to his desire to be freed from his promise regarding the cession of Modena and Reggio. On the 28th of May he granted the request for the Cardinal's hat for John of Lorraine, but he did not so readily grant the King's further requests relating to the levying of a tenth.†

Meanwhile Cardinal Wolsey was indefatigable in his efforts to make London instead of Rome the centre of the peace negotiations. Rumours were soon heard of an Anglo-French understanding, including the restoration of Tournai and the marriage of Henry's daughter Mary to the Dauphin. Nor was this alliance between the two Kings all, for a general alliance between all the powers was proposed to be concluded in London instead of in Rome. In a masterly manner Wolsey knew how to combine an Anglo-French understanding with the forming

di Lorenzo de' Medici (1518) con Maddalena de la Tour d'Auvergne," Lettera d'Alfonsina Orsini a Ser Giovanni da Poppi. Firenze, 1882 (*Nozze Publ.*).

* FABRONIUS, 291; NITTI, 108.

† Manuscr. Torrig., XXIII., 17 *seq.*, 21, 23, 24; VOLTELINI, 579 *seq.*; CIACONIUS, III., 418; CARDELLA, III., 74; NITTI, 109 *seq.*; VERDI, 96 *seq.*

VOL. VII.

of a general treaty of peace, to be guaranteed by England and France. By July all parties had agreed so far that the League in its essentials could be presented to the Pope. Leo knew but too well that this League would completely destroy his plan of a five years' truce, and that therefore all his efforts to raise a Crusade were adroitly set aside.* He had no doubt whatever that a general peace would put insuperable obstacles in the way of what could only be made possible by a truce. The Pope emphatically pointed out how much more likely to be observed was an agreement concluded for only a limited time, than one which professed to be a permanency.†

To all the Pope's remonstrances, the justice of which was to be proved but too soon by succeeding events, France and England turned a deaf ear.‡ Leo yielded on the point of the Turkish war,§ bitterly lamenting that Wolsey's League deprived the Holy See of the office of universal arbitrator; for, by the vagueness of its outlines, the indefinite duration of the proposed peace made any positive results of a Crusade doubtful.||

Campeggio, who, after consenting to share his legatine powers with Wolsey ¶ had at last been allowed to land in England on the 29th of July, had proceeded to London and was there witness of his rival's triumph.** At the beginning of October, "on account of the danger from

* LANZ, *Einleitung*, 208.

† Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 13 *seq.*, 414; XXIV., 6.

‡ VOLTELINI, 64.

§ This is justly emphasized by NITTI, 120.

|| *Cf.* CHARRIÈRE, I., 74.

¶ RYMER (London ed.), XIII., 606-607; CHARRIÈRE, I., 73; VOLTELINI, 63.

** *Cf.* BRADY, *Anglo-Roman papers*, London, 1890, 34 *seqq.*; BREWER, *Henry VIII.*, I., London, 1884, 279 *seqq.*; MARTIN, 241 *seq.*

Turkey," there was finally concluded an alliance between England and France.*

Leo's hope of seeing a universal league of peace guaranteed by the Holy See was destroyed, and Wolsey with his counter-project had conquered. A great blow was thus struck at the international position of the Papacy.† How painful Wolsey's proceedings were to Leo X. is shown by a letter from Cardinal Medici to Campeggio, written on the 6th of October, 1518. "With great displeasure," he says, "has His Holiness learned that Wolsey has set aside the proposal of a five years' truce, because he does not wish to leave the final position of affairs in the hands of the Pope. No Christian—far less a Cardinal—should venture to express himself in that way, and least of all Wolsey, who has received so many honours and favours from the Holy Father. From this we can see what the Holy See and the Pope have to expect from the English Chancellor."‡

At last the Pope saw before him no alternative except to ratify the London agreement. This he did finally on the 31st of December, 1518, with, however, the proviso that throughout all the arrangements the liberties of the Holy See were to be respected.§

* DUMONT, IV., 266 *seq.*; LANZ, Einleitung, 208. Campeggio remained in England till the middle of August 1519. The Turkish war continued to be talked of (*cf.* EHSES, Dokum., XXIV.), but nothing came of it. On Henry VIII. the accounts of the Turkish peril made as much impression as if the occurrences were taking place in the Indies; see SANUTO, XXVI., 237. Campeggio returned to Rome on Nov. 28, 1519; see Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 433-434, and DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 77.

† CREIGHTON, IV., 253.

‡ Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 21.

§ RYMER (VI., 1, 174, London ed., XIII., 681) gives the draft of the Bull, *Gaude et lactare, Jerusalem*, sent to Henry VIII. The draft

At the same time that Wolsey carried off his great diplomatic victory over Leo X., news reached Rome of the closing of the German Diet,* at which Cardinal Cajetan, as Papal Legate, had had to defend the arrangements as to the Crusade.

Cajetan, besides being the bearer of a courteous Brief, had with him, for the Emperor Maximilian, the Hat and Sword, consecrated martial insignia which the Supreme Pontiff was wont to send on extraordinary occasions to the most prominent princes. But Cajetan's mission was made unpleasant by the fact that the Emperor's ambitious adviser, Cardinal Lang, forbade him to enter the country until Leo X. had issued his own appointment as co-legate, which had been agreed to on the 17th of May.† Therefore, it was not until the 7th of July that he arrived at Augsburg, where he was solemnly received by the Emperor and the other princes.‡

When the blessed weapons were presented to him, Maximilian replied that, in spite of his age, he would, "under the protection of the helmet of the Spirit and the sword of Faith, join without fear in the expedition against the infidel." Four days later, Cajetan, in a fluent Latin discourse,§ proved

of that sent to Francis I. is in the Regest. 1203, f. 188-199^b, Secret Archives of the Vatican. Cf. Manosc. Torigg., XXV., 6; LANZ, *Einleitung*, 210; BUSCH, *Engl. Vermittlungspolitik*, 24.

* Manosc. Torigg., XXIV., 22.

† See KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 105 *seq.* At that time the successor to Campeggio as Nuncio was Caracciolo. PIEPER (53) believes that he entered on his office as early as the autumn of 1517. But it seems that Caracciolo only started in the spring of 1518, for in his *credentials, dat. Rome, 1518, March 6, his arrival is announced to the Marquis of Mantua. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ VOLTELINI, 69. KALKOFF, in *Quellen und Forsch.*, X., 226 *seq.*

§ See Hutteni opera, ed. BOECKING, V., 162 *seq.*, and THEINER, *Mon. Pol.*, II., 386 *seq.* Cf. ULMANN, II., 714.

before the assembled States the urgent necessity of a war against the Turks, and of the proposals laid down by the Pope for this end. He pointed out emphatically that Germany was in greater danger from the enemy of Christianity than any other country. The proposal he made was that for three years the clergy should pay a tenth, and the well-to-do laity a twentieth, of their income, and that as to the remainder of the population every fifty householders should provide one soldier for the Holy War. He gave the fullest guarantees as to the proper disposal of the money thus raised ; for all in Rome knew well enough that the States of Germany were less inclined than ever before to make financial sacrifices, and were possessed by the idea that the tithes and other Crusade funds were being raised for the enrichment of the Medici. Therefore Cardinal Farnese had been instructed to observe the greatest caution in handling financial matters, and to avoid everything which could feed the suspicion that there was any other possible destination for the Crusade money than the Crusade itself.* That Cajetan was instructed in a similar manner can be seen clearly by his cautious way of proceeding. He emphatically declared that it was left entirely to the Germans themselves to claim, receive, and dispose of the money in their own way. The money was to be devoted entirely to the Crusade, and if the Holy War did not take place within a given time, the money would be

* The original draft is in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 125-128. Epitome in KALKOFF, Prozess, 115 ; here also, 97 *seq.*, we find the proof that the instructions given to Farnese were handed over to Cajetan. Besides the copies given by Kalkoff from Cod. Vat., 3924, and Cod. Barb., 846, the instructions are to be found in Cod. Regin., 385, P. II., f. 333-340, Cod. Urb., 865, f. 20 *seqq.*, and Cod. Ottob., 3141, f. 1-5 (Vatican Library), as also in the State Archives, Munich : Instruct. et relat. nunt. apost., I.

returned. Whatever might be said, the Pope wanted none of the money raised, and the disposal of the war funds was to remain exclusively with the German States.

The answer which the Emperor made to this shows that the ever-needy monarch was not pleased with the Pope's disclaimer of any intention of controlling the funds raised, for this cut off all possibility of retaining a portion of them for himself.* Therefore Maximilian submitted the following proposal to the States:—If it seemed to them that the method of raising the money among the clergy and laity proposed by the Legate was not a wise one, he would suggest, as an alternative, that each person who went to Holy Communion during the next three years should contribute what he was able according to the dictates of his conscience.†

The States eagerly adopted this proposal, and all adverse representations from the Legate, warmly supported by the Polish envoy,‡ proved vain. The end of a lengthy conference was that on the 27th of August Cajetan's proposals were vetoed by the States. The reason they gave was the alleged grievance of the Germans against the Holy See. After a lively description of the impoverishment of Germany by war and other misfortunes, it was proclaimed that the opinion of the people of the land was universally adverse to the present mode of raising money. The common impression was that great sums of money, whether for Crusade or indulgences, would be taken out of Germany under any circumstances, whether the Turkish war was carried out or not. This conviction gave birth to great distrust. The nation was also burdened with annates, increased and extended by confirmation fees and endless other fees for

* ULMANN, II., 715. Cf. VOLTELINI, 70 *seq.*

† JANSSEN, Reichskorrespondenz, II., 972.

‡ Erasmus Ciolek, Bishop of Plock.

succession and reserved rights. The Concordat was violated, the right of patronage encroached on, and greater and lesser benefices conferred on foreigners. All this had given rise in Germany to such distrust and indignation that any further burden seemed to be out of the question.*

In these grievances we can hear the echo of the violent anti-curial feeling which had taken possession of all, not only of the younger generation of humanists, but of the whole German people.† There were general complaints of the violation of the Concordat, of the amount of the annates, of the severity of the chancery laws, and of the benefice-hunting which was encouraged by the Pope. The more the people thought that they were victimized financially, so much the more acute was the antipathy to any question of raising money. In this the clergy were quite agreed with the laity.‡ This hostile state of mind was aggravated by malicious pamphlets, the authors of which hid themselves under cover of anonymity. One of these declared openly that the real Turk lived in Italy, and that this "hound of hell" could be appeased only by streams of gold. "From his own dominions," says this poisoned pamphlet,§ which is redolent of the most violent invective against Rome, "streams of wealth flow in to the Pope as to no other Christian prince; yet we have to pay for palliums, and send asses laden with gold to Rome, and exchange gold for corn, and rest content with blood-lettings—pardon me, I mean with indulgences! Woe to this monster of avarice

* JANSSEN, *Reichskorrespondenz*, II., 978 *seq.* Cf. THEINER, *Mon. Pol.*, II., 390 *seq.*

† For what concerned the Austrian hereditary dominions, cf. VOLTELINI, 66 *seq.*

‡ Cf., e.g., with reference to the cathedral chapter of the chief German church, MAY, *Albrecht II.*, I, 159.

§ Thus does VOLTELINI (66) style this pamphlet.

which is never satisfied ! The craftiness of the Florentine discovers a thousand devices, each one more execrable than the last. Let German freedom be mindful not to become tributary, and not to pay tenths.”*

Still more violent in its expressions is a memorandum written apparently by Johann von Vlatten, and presented to the States in the name of the clergy of Liège. The impression made by it can be seen by the judgment which the deputies of the Frankfort Diet passed on it : “ So much violence, deceit, and roguery—disguised though it may be in beautiful Latin—is at the present time practised in Rome by the wickedness of Popes and their familiars and courtiers, that the grievances are retailed with a gusto never before known ” †

In face of the anti-curial feeling thus stirred up, Cajetan’s efforts to carry out his mission could not fail to be fruitless. However little cause existed this time to doubt the disinterestedness of the Pope or his wish to have nothing to do with the money raised, ‡ the States persisted in their assertion that his only object was to receive the money into his own hands. Leo complained bitterly over the Legate’s report to this effect. He lamented the dissemination of false views as to his intentions, and of

* *Oratio dissuasoria* (in KNAAKE, *Jahrbücher*, I., 254 *seq.* ; and in Hutteni opera, ed. BOECKING, V., 168 *seq.*), which was formerly attributed by mistake to Hutten ; see RANKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, I.⁶ 219, and STRAUSS, *Hutten*, I., 309 *seq.* The true authorship has not yet been ascertained. Cf. WALTZ in the *Histor. Zeitschrift*, XLI., 234 *seq.*, and GEBHARDT, *Gravamina*, 95 *seq.*

† JANSSEN, *Reichskorrespondenz*, II., 983. The Bishop of Liège, Eberhard de la Mark, rightly denied that he was the author of this protest (pr. KAPP, *Kleine Nachlese*, II., 397 *seq.* ; cf. GEBHARDT, *loc. cit.*, 99 *seq.*). See ULMANN, II., 711 ; KALKOFF, *Aleander*, 218, 219.

‡ Cf. HEGEWISCH, *Maximilian I.*, II., 159 ; KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 100.

calumnies against the Holy See. He wished to refute these by his actions, so that the calumniators might see for themselves that he had no thought of appropriating the Crusade levies, but intended to leave their disposal entirely to foreign hands.* Whether, under the circumstances, and considering the anti-Papal feeling of the Diet, the Pope's representative thought it expedient to pass on these complaints, is doubtful.† His words would have made no impression. Even the alarming news which reached Rome at this time, that Hungary was threatened with an attack from the Turks, which Leo used as a lever when pressing his appeal for help to Maximilian, Charles, Francis, and Henry, though it caused fear, did not act as an inducement to these princes to assist Christendom at the cost of any sacrifice to themselves.‡ When better news followed, the balance of opinion swung back, and the Turkish scare was jeered at.§

On the 14th of September the States delivered to the Emperor the reply that they must confer with their subjects on the matter of any money grant for the Crusade. At the same time they requested His Majesty to treat with Cajetan about the observance of the Concordat and the matter of annates. Maximilian agreed on this point.|| As regarded the Turkish war-tax, the States firmly adhered to their resolution that the tenth of a florin should be paid by each person who went to Holy Communion during the next three years. But they repeated that, even as regarded this concession, they must confer with their subjects! At the

* Briefs of August 22 and 23. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 792; EVERS, Martin Luther, II., 447 *seq.*

† Cf. KALKOFF, Forschungen, 109.

‡ Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 5, 18, 23; VOLTELINI, 71.

§ VOLTELINI, 72.

|| JANSSEN, Reichskorrespondenz, II., 989 *seq.*, 995.

same time they reiterated their complaints against the Roman See, and demanded redress. Cajetan explained that the proposed method of raising money was at once too insecure and too insignificant ; but that he was unable to give his final decision before the reply of the States was put into writing. This was on the 20th of September. Thereupon both princes and States left the Diet, so that no one remained who was able to give the reply demanded by the Legate.*

A special memorandum was prepared in Rome in answer to the complaints brought by the States against the Apostolic See. The introduction to this remarkable document acknowledged with astute diplomacy the readiness of the Germans to support the Crusade ; though it was urged as of paramount necessity that before the assembly of the next Diet, the princes should be assured of the consent of the States. The memorandum sought to reconcile conflicting opinions. If, it urged, it were true that Germany was enfeebled by famine and plague, these evils should not keep the people back from raising a Crusade, but should on the contrary spur them on to the enterprise, for their misfortunes were a warning to them from heaven. To the reproach that in times past the Crusade funds had been turned to other purposes, it was replied that the present Pope was not answerable for the misdeeds of his predecessors : moreover, even when he was Cardinal, he had known by personal observation that the money collected abroad for the raising of a Crusade had never reached Rome. But the plan which had been proposed this time regarding the Crusade funds gave every security against

* Cf. THEINER, *Mon. Pol.*, II., 389 ; LISKE in *Forsch. zur Deutsch. Gesch.*, XVIII., 643 *seqq.* ; JANSSEN, *Reichskorrespondenz*, II., 994, 998. Cf. *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXVI., 191, and KALKOFF, 127 *seq.* ; also 211 *seq.*, Cajetan's report to Leo X., Sept. 20, 1518.

abuse. As regarded the annates, there was no ground for complaint against the Pope, for they were paid only once in the lifetime of each prelate, whereas the holders of all churches and benefices were bound to pay the *decima* to the Pope. As regarded the newly instituted offices, there was no ground for complaint, as by these measures no one was injured except the Pope himself, who allotted a portion of his own income to the colleges of the newly appointed *officiales*.

To the reproach about the expectancies and reservations, it was replied by pointing out that these had been practised from time immemorial in Rome, and that the present Pope had introduced nothing new. In the same way the complaints against the chancery laws and granting of benefices were disposed of. As regarded the derogation of lay patronage, the present Pope had acted more circumspectly than his predecessors. As to the violation of the Concordat, it must be shown wherein it had not been observed, except for just and honourable reasons and at the request of the Emperor. He would willingly do away with other "extraordinary burdens," but he could not possibly allow the liberty of the Holy See to be prejudiced at the will of the irresponsible and easily-led multitude. In conclusion, the importance of a war against the infidel was reiterated, and the Legates were exhorted to leave nothing undone to incline the thoughts of princes and States towards undertaking a Crusade; as regarded these, they were to do their best to refute unjust accusations, and assure them that the Pope was willing to give up not only annates and all monies hitherto paid, but even his life, for the cause of Christianity.*

* *Respondet Summus Pontifex legatis in Germania ad decretum Imperii Aug. Copy in Cod. Vat., 3917, f. 6-8^l, Vatican Library. *Cj.* ULMANN, II., 720-721.

On the 3rd of October Cardinal Cajetan was directed to leave the Imperial court only when all hopes of attaining his object had vanished.* It is a matter of uncertainty whether in Rome, as in Germany,† men pretended to be not altogether dissatisfied with the result of the Diet, or whether they were in the main quite satisfied.‡ Certain hopes had, it is true, to be completely abandoned, particularly as the Emperor had at once agreed to the five years' truce, and promised to promote the Turkish war.§ These concessions were connected with the Emperor's efforts to procure for his grandson Charles V. the succession to the Empire.

This important question came more and more prominently into the foreground. In order to gain the favour of the Pope in this matter, Maximilian and Charles, as well as their rival Francis I., manifested their willingness, nay, their desire, to carry on a Holy War against the infidel. But, at least on the part of Francis, these offers of assistance were not meant seriously,|| however emphatic his protestations that before three years had passed he would be in Constantinople or die in the attempt.¶

Charles's intentions seem to have been more sincere.** In a submissive letter of the 20th of November, he declared

* Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 18-19; *cf.* 22.

† *Cf.* ULMANN, II., 720.

‡ KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 109, is of this opinion.

§ *Cf.* KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 129 *seq.*

|| *Cf.* IMBART DE LA TOUR, I., 95.

¶ RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, I.² 366. *Cf.* ZINKEISEN, II., 603. In spite of all his protestations, Francis had done nothing more than send a fleet against the Corsairs, to win the Pope's favour in the election. See ZINKEISEN, II., 603-604, and RAUMER'S *Histor. Taschenbuch*, 1856, 570.

** For the negotiations with Charles about the Crusade, in which from the beginning the question of money was the difficulty, *cf.* Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 416, 418; XXIV., 8, 209, 220.

his desire to devote all that he had to the great undertaking.* But it was doubtful whether the young sovereign would be in a position to keep his sweeping promises. The deep-rooted opposition of the Spanish clergy to the raising of a Crusade tax,† as well as the many other difficulties with which Charles was beset on all sides, might have dashed the hopes of even such optimists as Egidio Canisio.‡ But then came the question of the election, which swallowed up Charles's finances. Roman diplomacy also was soon so taken up by the same question, that the matter of the Crusade fell quite into the background.§

* The letter, dated from Saragossa, 1518, Nov. 20 (SANUTO, XXVI., 268 *seqq.*), was received in Rome on the 3rd of December (*ibid.*, 250). Thereupon a laudatory *Brief was sent to Egidio Canisio, dated Rome, 1518, Dec. 12, Arm., XLIV., t. 5, f. 161. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

† Cf. LA FUENTE, V., 107 *seqq.*, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, VIII., 751. See also, Manosc. Torrig., XXVI., 198.

‡ Cf. the characteristic letter of Canisio, Aug. 10, 1518, in ULMANN, Studien, 95 *seq.* Canisio returned to Rome in the summer of 1519; on the 6th of July he was received in open Consistory. Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 74.

§ In the spring of 1519 Hungary concluded a three years' truce with the Sultan (THEINER, Mon. Hung., II., 626 *seqq.*). Leo received the news of this at the moment when the Hungarian Ambassador was soliciting aid to carry on the Crusade! (cf. FRANKÓI, Werbőczy Istuan, Budapest, 1894). In Rome the matter of the Crusade was now looked on as so hopeless, that Leo spoke officially in a *Brief to the Waiwodes of Wallachia of the possibility of a "treuga seu conventio" being concluded between the Curia and the Turks; see the **Briefs dated Rome, 1519, 3^o Non. Iunii (June 3), in Regest. 1199, f. 362, of Secret Archives of the Vatican. The premature and unexpected death of the Sultan, Selim I., on Sept. 21, 1520, contributed not a little to the cooling of the crusading ardour on all sides (ZINKEISEN, II., 611). His successor, Suleiman I., was generally considered to be a peace-loving sovereign, who thought but little about war. Leo shared this opinion of him. "We must," he wrote on Dec. 6, 1520, "be all the more thankful for

this joyful news, because nothing is now to be gained from the Christian princes for the common good, except vain hopes and empty promises" (BEMBI, *Epist.*, XVI., 25). But the disillusionment of these hopes was not long in coming. In June, 1521, Suleiman embarked on his great campaign against Hungary; on Aug. 28 the citadel of Belgrade fell into his hands (HUBER, III., 523). Leo X., though entangled in the war with France, had nevertheless supplied Hungary with considerable sums of money. According to FRAKNÓI (*Magyar-ország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római szentszékkal*, II., 1418-1526, Budapest, 1902, 329), who refers to the Venetian Ambassador, the sum amounted to 30,000 ducats; while, according to TIZIO, **Hist. Senen.*, it was 24,000 aurei (*Cod. G.*, II., 39, f. 47, Chigi Library, Rome).

CHAPTER VI.

LEO X. AND THE IMPERIAL SUCCESSION.

No period of the pontificate of Leo X. has been more discussed or so differently judged than his attitude regarding the important question of the succession to the Empire. It is very difficult to form a correct judgment of his policy, through all its hesitations and evasions, its deviations and changes, or to bring to light the true motives and objects which he kept so carefully hidden. This difficulty remains in spite of the documentary evidence which, if by no means complete, is sufficiently abundant to make known with tolerable clearness all that is essential to the understanding of Leo's attitude. By a closer study of the sources of information, it is shown that the opinion held so long, that the Pope allowed himself to be guided in this matter solely by nepotism, is undoubtedly incorrect.*

* This view was advocated by BAUMGARTEN (*Politik Leos X.*, 555 *seq.*, 566, and, *Karl V.*, I., 122, 128, 130), who, however, successfully combated the opinion, held by De Leva, Rösler, and Maurenbrecher, that in the main Leo favoured the unconditional choice of Charles from the beginning, and only pretended to favour Francis I. NITTI (*cf.* especially note 225 *seq.*) refuted Baumgarten's account so completely that the latter had to admit that he had coloured the influence of family interests on Leo's policy too highly (*Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.*, 1893, 14). Before this, VOLTELINI (584) had rightly pointed out that Baumgarten had passed too severe a judgment on Leo; and BROSCHE (I., 56 *seq.*) brought this out still more clearly. Nevertheless it must not be denied that Nitti also either went too far or was mistaken on several points. For the modification of his views, see especially ULMANN, *Studien*, II., 101 *seqq.*;

On the contrary, what Leo X. had most at heart were the temporal power and independence of the Holy See and the so-called liberty of Italy.* The exaltation of his relatives, on which he was undeniably too much bent, came only in the second place. All these different objects worked simultaneously with him, and in trying to promote one he was at the same time working for the others. In individual cases it is often difficult to decide with any certainty which motive was strongest, and which was relegated to the background.

If we take a general view of the whole attitude maintained by Leo X. in the years 1518 and 1519, we can see that the leading motive of his conduct in the matter of the imperial succession was the care that the temporal and moral influence of the Holy See should suffer no injury, were an already powerful prince to gain possession of the imperial crown.† The crown of Charlemagne was still surrounded by a mystic halo; and if in reality it did not possess the same significance, it might offer to an ambitious prince a title—not to be underrated—to many dangerous claims. Wolsey expressed the opinion of the time when he wrote to his Ambassador in Rome that scarcely anything on earth could be compared with the imperial dignity.‡

Looked at from this point of view, neither of the two

cf. BERNAYS in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, 74, 516 *seq.* On the other hand, DE LEVA'S censures (*Atti d. Ist. Veneto*, 4 Series, IV., 748 *seq.*) are for the most part unjustified; about which Nitti successfully defends himself in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XVI., 182. Here Nitti admits his error regarding Castiglione, pointed out for the first time by CIAN in *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, 1892, 421.

* NITTI, 161.

† Leo X. expressed himself in this sense to the Ambassador of Henry VIII., after the imperial election. *See* the Report of this on August 26, 1519, in *Arch. stor. Ital.*, App., I., 322.

‡ Letter of March 25, 1519, in BREWER, Henry VIII., I., 312.

Kings who were the most eager candidates for the imperial dignity was pleasing to the Pope. Either Charles of Spain or Francis I. would obtain a supremacy as Emperor, which might be very dangerous to the Holy See and to Italy, especially as one had already a footing in the south, and the other in the north of the peninsula. If at first the dislike of the Pope to the election of Charles was the more prominent, it is easily explained. Charles, to whom, on the 1st of April, 1517, Leo had confirmed the title of "Catholic King,"* ruled not only over Aragon and Castile, but also over Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, as well as over the Burgundian-Dutch territory, in addition to countries of incalculable importance in the New World. Not only was Charles the more powerful of the two, but he held larger views about the imperial dignity; whereas the designs of the French King were not so well known to Rome.† Charles, moreover, might be especially dangerous to the Holy See because, by his sovereignty over Naples, he could make a much deeper impression on Rome than could the possessor of Milan. It had been the principle of the Holy See since the time of the Hohenstaufen that the crown of Naples could never belong to the Emperor; and this now weighed heavily in the balance. "Do you know," asked Leo one day of the Venetian Ambassador, "how many miles it is from here to the borders of the Neapolitan territory? Forty. Then Charles must never be appointed King of Rome!"‡ Leo had every right to appeal to the Bull of Julius II. (July 3, 1510), relating to the investiture of Ferdinand the Catholic with the crown of Naples.§

* Bull., V., 691-692.

† See Reichstagsakten, I., 125.

‡ BROWN, II., n. 1175.

§ Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 324, n.
VOL. VII.

But, on the other hand, an increase of the power of the French King could not be desired by the Pope. Not only as sovereign of Milan, but in a variety of other ways, the ambition and spirit of enterprise of Francis I. had already made things very uncomfortable for the Holy See.*

After much deliberation, the idea occurred to Leo X. whether the imperial crown might not be given to a third party—to some German prince—who was not already too powerful, and who had no connection with Italy. Already Rome had turned her eyes towards the “most earnest and clever” of the Electors, Frederick of Saxony, as a possible candidate for the imperial dignity.† In this Leo was not influenced by any worldly or political reason, but solely by the interests of the Church. The Elector of Saxony possessed as his subject that passionate professor of Wittenberg, Martin Luther, whose new doctrines seemed so dangerous that it had been already determined in the beginning of September to procure the help of Frederick against him by the gift of the Golden Rose, which he had desired for three years. On the 7th of October, 1518, Cardinal Cajetan was commissioned to confer this mark of distinction on him, on the condition that he would agree to deliver up Luther.‡ The same idea gave birth to the thought of holding before him the prize of the imperial crown as an inducement to take measures to suppress the Lutheran movement. This may explain the difficulties made by the Elector Frederick, which were such as

* VOLTELINI, 583; BAUMGARTEN, Politik Leos X., 554 *seq.*

† VOLTELINI, 583.

‡ Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 23. Cf. SANUTO, XXVI., 18, and KALKOFF, Prozess, 280. See the resolution of the Consistory of Sept. 3, in which the Pope moved to send the Golden Rose to the Elector of Saxony, “nonnullis de causis,” in KALKOFF, Forschungen, 56.

to lead the Pope to make advances on the same lines to the more ecclesiastically-minded Elector, Joachim of Brandenburg.*

The scheme of the Pope to promote the choice of one of the Electors for the imperial crown, can be seen more clearly during the second period of the contest for that supreme dignity, after the death of Maximilian, when, as was but natural, the struggle became more acute. From the beginning, Leo X. was sincere in wishing for neither Charles nor Francis—least of all the former. There can be scarcely a doubt as to this, however skilfully he tried to conceal his real opinions, or however often he seemed to waver.

I.

Maximilian's plan to secure his grandson Charles's succession to the Empire, by ensuring his choice at the Diet of Augsburg as King of Rome, became known at the Vatican in the middle of April 1518, or perhaps sooner,† and affected the mind of the Pope most painfully.‡ By the middle of August this election of Charles was supposed in Rome to be immediately impending, even if not already accomplished.

Leo's attitude towards Charles at that time was fully though cautiously described in a letter from Cardinal Giulio de' Medici to Cardinal Bibbiena, who was then in France. Two reasons, says Medici, were alleged why the Pope considered that the truth of the report should be duly weighed. First, His Holiness wondered how Maximilian could have contrived to persuade the Electors to choose a King of Rome so quickly and so easily, as

* In this I am following VOLTELINI, 584.

† See Letter of Bibbiena, April 18, 1518, in *Lett. d. princ.*, I., 52.

‡ See VOLTELINI, 581, and BERNAYS in the *Hist. Zeitschr.*, 74, 516.

hitherto such an election had not taken place before the death of the predecessor, or at any rate before his coronation as Emperor. Secondly, the Pope was astonished how Charles could have accepted the election so unreservedly, in face of the decree of Julius II., in which it was expressly laid down that the investiture to the kingdom of Naples lapsed and returned to Rome, as soon as the occupant of the Neapolitan throne was elected to be King of Rome. The Pope was convinced that when he had secured the title of King of Rome, Charles would still keep possession of the throne of Naples. He feared still more that, after the imperial election had been carried out, the confirmation of Charles as Emperor in the possession of Naples would be demanded of the Holy See, which would gain but little by the concession. In face of this condition of things, Bibbiena was instructed to obtain promptly and by any means, information as to the position of the French King, so that the Pope might act accordingly.

If Francis attached but little importance to the matter of the election, the Pope could accommodate himself to the situation, and draw the best possible advantage from it, even if this should be but slight compared with the great favour at stake. If, on the other hand, he knew for certain that the election of Charles would be displeasing to the French King, and that in the case of a refusal or delay in granting the investiture of Naples, he could rely upon France, he would act otherwise, for the greater dignity and security of the Holy See.

At the conclusion of this remarkable letter the writer once more emphasized the obligation of the Pope to protect his ancient and sacred rights, in the interests of the Roman See. For two hundred years it had never given the investiture of the throne of Naples without the

express condition which excluded its union with the title of King of Rome. If he now departed from this rule he would be acting against the precedent given by his predecessors, and also against his own principles, besides exposing himself to great dangers. On the other hand, a refusal of investiture would provoke the anger of Maximilian and Charles; and this he could not venture to do without the help and favour of France.*

This letter is very characteristic of Leo's attitude. No one could infer from it that he would take up a decided position against Charles. Nevertheless, it is no secret that the Pope was by no means desirous of his election, or that he would willingly work against it if he could be sure beforehand of the support of France. Before he had obtained such a certainty he did not wish to cut himself off from the possibility of an arrangement with Charles, which he might turn to account to the advantage of his family.† Moreover, Charles's acceptance of the five years' truce, and his offers to help in the Turkish war, which had been laid before the Cardinals at a Consistory held on the 23rd of August,‡ deterred Leo from taking open measures against the Spanish King. But that the Pope should, by making a virtue of necessity, have at that time agreed to Charles's election, was not honest.§ He had not, however, arrived at a final decision. His natural hesitancy was increased by the extraordinary difficulty of the situation; for, as matters stood, he had to choose between breaking with the Emperor and Spain, or with France. In

* Manosc. Torrig., XXIII., 410-411.

† *Ibid.*, 418, 420, XXIV., 8; VOLTELINI, 587 *seq.*

‡ KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 126.

§ In other words, "decidedly dishonest." NITTI, 117. *Cf.*, for the same opinion, BERNAYS in the *Hist. Zeitschr.*, 74, 516.

September the news reached Rome that Maximilian had obtained the votes of four Electors for the choice of Charles to be King of Rome; but that the Elector of Saxony was very much against any such plan, and wished the dignity to be conferred on a German. It was believed that his opposition originated in his desire to be chosen himself.* This gave birth to the idea of the Saxon candidature for the imperial crown.† At first Leo observed great reserve in his outward actions. When Francis I. expressed a desire to take energetic measures against the election of Charles, the Pope drew his attention to the difficulties attendant on such an undertaking and the danger of kindling a great war.‡ Leo described the project of Francis I. for forming a League between the Pope, Florence, France, Switzerland, and Venice as very delightful in itself, but one which had to be treated with great prudence, lest the general peace should be disturbed.§ It is clear that he hesitated to hand over his interests to the discretion of his French protector, in spite of Lorenzo's strong advocacy of the cause of France.|| This explains why he kept up communications with Francis, with whom, ever since July, he had been exchanging proposals for the formation of a closer alliance.¶ As regarded the dispensation from the oath of fealty for Naples, which was so urgently needed for the success of the plans of Maximilian and Charles, it was Leo's policy not to

* SANUTO, XXVI., 51.

† KALKOFF, Prozess, 403.

‡ Letter of Card. Giulio de' Medici of October 14, to Bibbiena. Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 24.

§ Letter of Card. Medici of October 30, to Bibbiena. Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 25-26.

|| Cf. VERDI, 104 *seq.*

¶ See LANZ, Einleitung, 215, and ULMANN, Studien, 103, 104.

cut off all hope of an agreement, but to bind himself to nothing.*

The difference with Rome, which began in November, 1518, was very injurious to Francis' aims. The reason of the quarrel has never been satisfactorily explained. It seems that the French King wanted to take undue advantage of his matrimonial alliance with the Pope's family, and while he asked for much, he gave nothing. Cardinal Medici, in a letter to Bibbiena, complained bitterly of Francis' conduct. "The Pope," he wrote, on the 11th of November, "sees that his family alliance, far from bringing him an increase of honour and renown, causes nothing but vexation and anxiety. Every day he is showing the King some fresh favour, yet he is being always pressed with some new and weighty demand. These are made just as if he had received nothing before. If his requests are not granted at once, all that has gone before counts for nothing. His encroachments on the spiritual rights of Milan by his appointment to benefices, have been carried so far as to amount to a formal contempt of Papal authority. By his indulgence and complaisance towards the French King the Pope has drawn on himself a number of vexations and disputes." Francis I. had sent a threatening letter to the Pope on this very subject of the Milanese benefices, and this letter was enclosed by Cardinal Medici to Bibbiena, that the latter might see what just cause for complaint the Pope had.

To these complaints there were added others which were retailed to Bibbiena by Cardinal Giulio in a letter of the 28th of November. These related to the salt-mines in the States of the Church, a suspicious alliance with the Duke of Ferrara, as well as various encroachments on the Papal dominions. After all these occurrences, it is not

* Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 20 ; VERDI, 102.

surprising, Medici goes on to say, that His Holiness should suspect Francis of a design to alienate him from the Emperor, and then, having left him stranded, hold him in his power.*

These pointed complaints must have made an impression on Francis I., all the deeper because of his fear that the Pope would end by yielding to the pressure of the Emperor and Spain, and remove the obstacles which stood in the way of Charles's election. These obstacles were twofold. First there was the existence of the oath of fealty for the throne of Naples, the terms of which forbade that crown being worn by one who held the dignity of King of Rome. There was also what had hitherto been the impossibility of an election of a King of Rome in the lifetime of another who had received the title, and who had not received the imperial crown. It was now proposed that the Pope should dispense with the clause in the oath of fealty, and that the imperial crown should be sent to Trent, where the Emperor might be crowned by either Cardinal de' Medici or the Archbishop of Mayence as representative of the Pope. Such was the request made by Charles at the end of November; but he received an evasive answer.†

Soon, however, symptoms were seen of an inclination on the part of the Pope to give way in both the matters of the oath of investiture and the imperial coronation. The cause of these signs of compliance lay in the circumstance that official intelligence had just been received by the Pope that Maximilian had agreed to the five years' truce, and held out hopes of supporting the Crusade.‡ In the

* Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 29-30, 210-213. Cf. BAUMGARTEN, *Politik Leos X.*, 538 *seq.*; VOLTELINI, 589 *seq.*

† SANUTO, XXVI., 212, 222; VOLTELINI, 591.

‡ Acta Consist., 5 and 10 Nov., in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 129, 130.

first half of November a Bull was prepared which provided for a dispensation from the obligation of renouncing Naples should Charles be elected King of Rome. But the pressure put on his uncle by Lorenzo caused the postponement of the execution of this deed.* Simultaneously with the drawing up of this Bull, Leo X. held out the hope to Maximilian that he would do his best to remove the second obstacle, and would perform the ceremony of the imperial coronation, either in person or by deputy, on the borders of the Tyrol and Italy.†

For one moment Lorenzo thought that France's cause was lost, and his only thought was to turn to advantage an opportunity not likely to occur more than once in a hundred years.‡ But Leo had by no means come to his final decision. This was shown only too plainly by his attitude towards Erasmus Vitellius (Ciolek), Bishop of Plock, who was sent to Rome by Maximilian on the 7th of November, 1518,§ to press the matter of sending the imperial crown to Germany.|| He could not obtain an audience till the 26th of November.¶ Then with skilful diplomacy he made it clear that Maximilian's co-operation

* Cf. the Letter of Bibbiena of Nov. 27, 1518, in *Lett. d. princ.*, I., 35 ; LE GLAY, II., 436 ; *Reichstagsakten*, I., 485 ; NITTI, 130 *seq.*

† Cf. *Archiv f. österr. Gesch.*, I., 113 ; ULMANN, *Maximilian II.*, 706, and *Studien*, 102. See also NITTI, 147.

‡ NITTI, 131.

§ Minio having mentioned the date of his arrival as Nov. 12, VOLTELINI (592) inclines to accept it ; but the 7th is stated by Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 68.

|| For what follows, cf. the learned deductions of VOLTELINI, 84 *seq.*, 592 *seq.* About Erasmus Vitellius, see the monograph overlooked by Voltelini, in LUKAS, *Erazm. Ciolek, biskup Plocki, dyplomata polski 16. wieku*, Warszawa, 1878.

¶ *Acta Consist.*, in KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 130, and Paris de Grassis in DELICATI-ARMELLINI, 68.

in the Turkish war depended on the request being granted. At the same time Spain tried to win the Pope over by making generous offers for the support of the Crusade, as well as for the exaltation of the Medici. But Leo still answered evasively to the effect that, though he would gladly comply with Maximilian's request, it must be saving his honour. "It is a question," said he, "of our own person and our own honour." When Erasmus, alluding to the meeting with Francis I. at Bologna, pleaded that the Pope might crown Maximilian, if not at Trent, at Verona or Mantua, Leo alleged against this the opposition which the Cardinals would make to such a journey. To test the feasibility of sending the imperial crown from Rome, a Congregation of Cardinals was called on the 1st of December, the majority of whom were unfavourable to the Emperor's proposal.*

This crisis was contemporaneous with the change already mentioned which had come over the attitude of Francis. After the representations made by Bibbiena, the French King had fully acknowledged the danger which threatened his efforts should the Pope, in his displeasure with him, yield to the wishes of Charles and Maximilian. He therefore resolved to change his tone. The first symptom of this change is to be found in a report sent by Bibbiena to Cardinal de' Medici and Lorenzo on the 26th and 27th of November, which shows the change of mind on the part of the King. Francis I. now declared himself ready not only to accede

* From SANUTO, XXVI., 250, VOLTELINI (596) concluded that the Congregation was called on the 2nd of December. Against this there is the authentic testimony, unknown to him, of the *Acta Consist., in which it is said: "Romae die mercurii, 1 Decemb. 1518, S. D. N., deputavit novem rev. dominos cardinales pro negotiis arduis et secretis tractandis vid., etc." (here follow the names). Consistorial Archives of the Vatican. Now printed in KALKOFF, *loc. cit.*, 130; cf. 33.

to Lorenzo's wishes as to the rounding off of his territory, but also—though in this we may assume that he was not in earnest—to renounce his own candidature, and, if the Pope so wished, promote the claims of the Elector of Saxony to be King of Rome. The condition of this was that nothing should be done by Rome in favour of Maximilian and Charles.*

Although the Roman Curia had adopted a more conciliatory tone towards Francis I., the latter did not feel sure that the Pope might not after all place himself on the side of his rivals. He adjured Bibbiena to prevent at all costs the sending of the imperial crown, and implored his help to prevent such a possibility as a journey of Maximilian to Rome. In a solemn audience he made the most generous offers about the Crusade, in which he said he would take part personally. He also expressed his willingness to waive all the points on which he was at variance with Rome, to promote the interests of the Medici, and conclude an alliance with the Pope.†

Negotiations for an alliance with Francis I. were carried on actively by Bibbiena. He was a master of Medicean diplomacy, and succeeded, without binding himself to anything, in raising deceptive hopes in the heart of the French King that the Pope would, in return for his concessions, take his part in the election. Charles was treated in exactly the same way, and he also was left with the impression that Leo would accede to his wishes; though to neither party were any pledges about the election given. When Francis demanded some guarantee, the dangers of a breach with Spain were pointed out. As regarded Charles, the Pope drew back at the most decisive moment, on the

* *Lettere d. princ.*, I., 31 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*

† *Lett. d. princ.*, I., 37 *seq.* Cf. BAUMGARTEN, *Politik Leos X.*, 542 *seq.*; VOLTELLINI, 597 *seq.*

plea that such a weighty matter required the most mature deliberation.*

Not only was the Bull of dispensation in respect to Naples kept back, but the other matter of sending the imperial crown was indefinitely postponed. The Congregation of Cardinals which the Pope had called to consider the question, demanded the verdict of the Master of Ceremonies, and he, on being consulted, declared that the coronation anywhere but in Rome was an impossibility.† On the 15th of December there was a meeting of the Congregation, held in the presence of the Pope, which lasted six hours. On the following day Leo X. informed the Bishop of Plock that he had been unable to carry the business through, as the Cardinals had brought forward, as reasons against it, both the novelty of the matter and the existence of Bulls which in times past had been issued in opposition to such a thing. He could not, he said, give the dispensation without the consent of the Sacred College. He would gladly have met the Emperor at Mantua or Verona, but was deterred by the consideration of the dangers to which such a journey might expose Maximilian.‡

On the 21st of December a Brief to Maximilian was prepared which informed him that his desires, conveyed through Erasmus Vitellius, concerning the Crusade indulgence in his patrimonial dominions, the protection of Croatia and Hungary, and the appointment of Cajetan as Legate in the last-mentioned country, should be granted.

* NITTI, 133 *seqq.*

† Even if the Pope, and he who was to be crowned, were together in the same town, the coronation might not on that account be performed. In such a case a Legate must be appointed to crown the Emperor in Rome. Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 425.

‡ See the Report of Erasmus Vitellius in VOLTELINI, 618 *seq.*, and SANUTO, XXVI., 284. The date Dec. 10 in VOLTELINI, 600, is a misprint.

But as to the matter of sending the imperial crown from Rome, though both Pope and Cardinals had every wish to be conciliatory, the matter, being one of such importance, required further consideration.*

By adjourning the decision of the main question, it was evident that Leo wished to gain time, until, in fact, he had made friends with Francis I. This event did not take place as soon as was wished in Rome.† In order to win over the French King, the Pope was ready to hand over to his free disposal the second Crusade tenth. The Bull concerning this is dated the 1st of December 1518.‡ It was, however, completed only at the end of that month, after Bibbiena, by his far-reaching assurances, had been able to arrive at an understanding with Francis I.§ On the 31st of December the French King pledged himself to pay back within four years 100,000 ducats of the Crusade money.|| At the same time Lorenzo de' Medici received, "for services rendered," 100,000 ducats from the King, out of the sum granted through the Pope. This was a shameful misuse of the money raised for the Holy War.¶

After this arrangement Francis at once, on the 20th of

* The Brief of Dec. 21, 1518, is from the original in the State Archives, Vienna, in VOLTELINI, 615-616; *ibid.*, 601 *seq.* For further details about the Crusade Bull of Dec. 21 (which, however, was not published, on account of Maximilian's death), cf. KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 130.

† VOLTELINI, 605.

‡ * Regest. 1203, f. 177-178 (dat. 1518, Cal. Decemb. A° 6°); GUICCIARDINI, XIII., 4; MICHAUD, VI., 297 *seq.* See also BOURLOTON, *La croisade prêchée dans le diocèse de Maillezais de mars 1517 à juillet 1518*, in the *Rev. d. Bas Poitou*, 1895, n. 4.

§ On Dec. 20 a report about this was made in Consistory; see *Acta Consist., Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.

|| Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 222.

¶ On Dec. 31, 1518, Lorenzo gave a receipt for more than 25,000 *livres tournois*; see MOLINI, I., 71-72.

January, 1519, signed the treaty of alliance with Leo X. On one side the French King, and on the other the Pope and Lorenzo, as representing Florence and the family of Medici, pledged themselves to the mutual defence of their possessions, and undertook to impart to one another all state secrets. In particular, Francis promised to acknowledge the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church in Milan, to protect the States of the Church, as well as Lorenzo and the Medici generally. This last took the form of a separate treaty. On the other side, the Pope and Lorenzo pledged themselves to further the French King's interests in every way in their power. But the question of the election was not touched on in the agreement.*

It has been brought to light only by recent researches that almost at the same moment Leo X. concluded an alliance of defence with the rivals of the King of France! Like Francis, the King of Spain was won over "by the illusion, confirmed by no pledge but carefully fostered, that in the matter of the election the Pope would be on his side."† On the 17th of January the text of this treaty, which, as was expressly stipulated, was to be kept secret, was drawn up, and signed by Charles on the 6th of February.‡

No more than in that with France, was there any mention of the election in the treaty with Charles. By this, both

* CAPPONI, *Storia di Firenze*, II., 543 (III.² 357 *seq.*), first published the treaty.

† ULMANN, *Studien*, II., 102.

‡ The official minutes of this treaty have been made known for the first time by CAPPONI in *Arch. stor. Ital.*, I., 370 *seq.*, and printed again in *Storia di Firenze*, II., 540 *seq.* (III.² 354 *seq.*). BAUMGARTEN (*Politik Leos X.*, 549) declares that the document was the work of the Papal chancery, done to propitiate the Spanish court. But in the State Archives, Florence, we find the minutes published by Capponi, which quite agree with the original bearing Charles's autograph signature. NITTI, 143, n.

parties pledged themselves to mutual assistance and the protection of their possessions. These, on the Papal side, included not only the States of the Church, but also the possessions of Lorenzo and Florence. On the other side, the term included Charles's possessions outside and inside Italy, with Naples. Besides all this, the Pope promised Charles, in the event of a serious war, the right to levy a tenth on the clergy of Spain.

By the light of these two treaties we can understand the policy of Leo X., and the manner in which he avoided making any actual decision in favour of either of the rivals who were competing for the imperial crown. By means of unparalleled double-dealing both parties were kept in hand, and moved, each to make a secret treaty, the object of which was the protection of the Pope and the Medici. The question of the Pope's support at the election, which each party thought was the object of the treaty, was not even mentioned in the document. It is, however, equally true that the special advantages which both Charles and Francis had promised in regard to the States of the Church and the Medici were left quite undefined.*

In excuse for Leo's ambiguous policy it has been pointed out that "in the then condition of Italy, the smaller States could scarcely hope to save their independence except by keeping themselves skilfully in the balance between the two great powers, which threatened to crush all others."† This may have been so; nevertheless, such double-dealing on the part of a Pope must be deeply deplored.

At this moment when the question of the coronation of Maximilian was dividing the whole of Europe, and when the arming of France and Spain was regarded as the prelude of a great war, the "last of the Knights" was

* NITTI, 145.

† VOLTELINI, 606.

snatched away by death on the 12th of January, under the age of sixty. The rivalry between the houses of France and Hapsburg entered on an acute stage which set its mark on European history for centuries.

II.

The unexpected and, to many, the incredible news of the death of Maximilian, which introduced an altogether changed condition of things, reached Rome eleven days after the event.* With one stroke it put an end to Leo's indecision. The danger lest Charles, the least desired candidate, should succeed in obtaining the dignity of King of Rome, which would entitle him to the imperial crown, seemed greater than ever. With unwonted promptitude the Pope came to a decision. Not twenty-four hours after the receipt of the startling news of the Emperor's death, instructions were sent to Cardinal Cajetan, the Legate in Germany, in which Leo took up his position in opposition to Charles quite openly and unambiguously, and proposed one of the German Electors as a candidate for the imperial crown, thus hoping to thwart the election of Francis as well as that of Charles. The Pope—so ran the instructions to Cajetan—wished, in the interests of the Apostolic See, to promote the choice of one of the Electors, either Frederick of Saxony or Joachim of Brandenburg; he cared not which, though there seemed to be more likelihood of success with the former. The King of Poland also would be pleasing as

* At latest on Jan. 23, perhaps on the preceding day; see *Manosc. Torrig.*, XXV., 18. Paris de Grassis in *HOFFMANN*, 423, and *SANUTO*, XXVI., 395, 419. *HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER* (VIII., 799) gives the wrong date of the 24th, and *NITTI* (145) the 21st. Leo announced the death of the Emperor in Consistory on the 24th; see *KALKOFF*, *Forschungen*, 131.

a candidate to the Holy See ; but under no consideration was it to be the King of Spain. The chief reason alleged for this was that the great power already possessed by Charles would be unbearably increased by the extraordinary authority of the imperial crown.* These instructions, dated the 23rd of January, were entirely the personal work of the Pope, because Cardinal Medici, on whose co-operation he usually depended in the matters connected with the election, had been called away to Florence in the night of the 22nd, by the severe illness of Lorenzo, and returned thence only on the 26th of March.†

The instructions sent to Cajetan to oppose the election of Charles apply equally to those sent in regard to the French King. Though his possessions could not compare in extent with those of Charles, still, his dominions were more united and richer in resources.‡ There can be no doubt that the Pope did not at all desire the election of the French King ; as a proof of this, when he was passing in review the candidates to the imperial throne, he passed Francis' name over

* Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 369-371 ; at the same time Cajetan received a draft on Fugger for the sum of 1000 golden ducats and credentials to the Bishop Electors (see KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 131). In the Brief of Jan. 23 the Pope favoured the Archduke Ferdinand as a candidate, but on the 16th and 20th he was emphatically rejected ; Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 383 ; cf. 385.

† KALKOFF first drew attention to this circumstance (*Prozess*, 404 seq.).

‡ Cf. Machiavelli's celebrated *Ritratti delle cose di Francia* and *Ritratti delle cose dell' Alemagna*, as pointed as they are witty, printed in the Milanese edition of Machiavelli's works, vol. i., Milano, 1850. "Et se, oltre a la auctorita et grandeza ordinaria che si trova ne la corona de Francia, vi si adiungessi questa altra extraordinaria de lo Imperio, N. S., conosce molto bene che il Cristianissimo andrebbe in cielo," wrote Medici on the 3rd of December, 1518, to Bibbiena. Manosc. Torrig., XXIV., 215.

in silence, as being out of the question.* Even in the instructions to Bibbiena on the 27th of January, bidding him try to obtain the support of the French court in favour of the candidature of one of the Electors, there is no mention made of the hope that, even under certain circumstances, Francis might be chosen.† But only two days later, on the afternoon of the 29th of January, Leo expressed openly to the French Ambassador his desire in favour of the election of Francis I., advising him to do everything he could to wrest the election from the Hapsburg. In the further course of conversation, he said quite candidly that Francis had better do his utmost to obtain the imperial dignity as the zenith of his ambition. Though Leo was convinced that it might be dangerous to have the imperial crown placed on the head of one already powerful, he would rather see it given to the sovereign of the obedient, religious, and judicious French than to the Catholic King.‡

Whence this sudden change of mind? Erasmus Vitellius, who was still in Rome, had shown to the Pope proofs of the absolute certainty of the election of Charles to the imperial throne, by revealing to him the contents of the compact of the five Electors, formulated at Augsburg. Although the conclusion, so favourable to Charles, which had been arrived at by the Diet of Augsburg, had been long since communicated to the Pope,§ it does not seem that he attached sufficient importance to it, seeing that it was couched in general terms and delivered verbally. Now, for the first

* Later, Leo sought to excuse his having thus passed him over on the plea that he did not know of Francis' candidature. *Manoscr. Torrig.*, XXV., 381.

† NITTI, 151, n. 1.

‡ *Reichstagsakten*, I., 158-160; *cf.* 204, 205.

§ *Manoscr. Torrig.*, XXIV., 20, and *SANUTO*, XXVI., 166.

time, Leo understood the full significance of the matter. The only hope of checking the election of Charles lay in prompt action.

In this frame of mind, on the 29th of January, Leo made his abrupt request to Francis through his representative, to lay claim forthwith to the imperial crown and work in every way possible against the candidature of Charles. Next day the Pope, through Pietro Ardinghello, sent a very important letter to his Legate in France, in which the question of the election was treated of in the same way. This change was caused by the compact of the Electors shown to the Pope by Vitellius, which put the election before him as being as good as settled, unless it could be promptly opposed. Francis was urged to come forward as a candidate, with every promise of support from the Pope. "If anything," the letter goes on, "having regard to the powerful position of the King, made the Electors wish for the candidature of a third party, Francis might give this nominee his active support as a means of preventing the election of the King of Spain. This step might be necessary, as Francis, by too strong an advocacy of his own cause, might play into the hands of Charles." In the first place, the Pope wished for the election of Francis; but if that could not be carried out, then the choice of any other seemed to him to be preferable to that of Charles.* The instructions sent to Bibbiena on the 5th and 12th of March are written in the same sense. The Pope, who had just received the ratification of the bond of the 20th of January, repeated the expression of his desire for the election of Francis; but at the same time, in the event of the French efforts being fruitless, he declared the necessity of trying to promote the election of a third party. In any case it must not be Charles.†

* Cf. Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 372-374.

† Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 374-376.

From such indications* it cannot be doubted that Leo warmly espoused the cause of Francis. Whether, in his inmost heart, he really desired his success, may still be considered doubtful. It is more probable that, as an immediate object, he was playing Francis against Charles, without sincerely desiring his election, or even believing in such an eventuality. Whether he became by degrees more favourable to the idea of a French Emperor cannot be said, or whether, if so, it came from a personal liking for Francis I. Probably he was influenced by the thought that nothing—not even that which might be feared most—could weigh in the balance against the increasing power of Charles. In essentials Leo went no further than this until a very short time before the actual election of Charles. Certain vacillations, entirely characteristic of the Medici Pope, must not altogether surprise us, though all through we can trace the dominant thought of Leo: Let there be no Hapsburg!† It was labour lost for the Spanish Legate, Egidio Canisio, to petition the Pope on behalf of Charles;‡

* Cf. VERDI, Lorenzo, III *seqq.*

† In the Letters to Bibbiena, Campeggio, Cajetan, and Caracciolo, the same idea always recurs; see Manosc. Torrig., XXV., 383 *seqq.* The Letter to Campeggio on Feb. 19, lately discovered, was taken by Henry VIII. as an encouragement to come forward himself as a candidate for the imperial crown. With this object, the English diplomatist, Richard Pace, went to Germany in the middle of May. About the English candidature, on which sufficient light is not yet thrown, cf. PAULI in the *Forsch. zur deutschen Gesch.*, I., 421 *seq.*; HÖFLER, *Wahl Karls V.*, 42 *seq.*; RÖSLER, *Kaiserwahl Karls V.*, 176 *seq.*; SMOLLE, *Karl V.*, in seinen Beziehungen zu Heinrich VIII.; Znaim, 1872, 5; BUSCH, *Vermittlungspolitik*, 40 *seq.*, 50 *seq.*; NITTI, 194 *seq.*; *Reichstagsakten*, I., 505, 663, 683 *seq.*; MARTIN, 239 *seqq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 115 *seq.* The last maintains that it is impossible to arrive at a final or well-established judgment about the real intentions of Henry and Wolsey on this point.

‡ Such as was, for instance, contained in a *letter which Egidio, by

but it is a fact that a third candidate, either the Elector of Saxony or the Elector of Brandenburg, would have been more agreeable to the Pope than either of the others. This became more evident every day. There is also, however, no doubt that the candidature of Francis, though probably taken up at first only as a means of putting aside the claims of Charles, was more desired by him as time went on, and he realized that his successful candidature was the only possible way of destroying Charles's chances.*

Besides the overwhelming extent of Charles's power, there were many other reasons which weighed in the balance against him in the mind of the Pope: such were the tyranny which Naples might exercise over Rome; the anti-Papal feeling which had governed so many of the Roman-Teutonic emperors; their union with the Ghibelline party in the States of the Church. While Leo drew Bibbiena's attention to these reasons against the candidature of Charles, he referred—but only in the last place, and not as to a thing of primary importance—to his family connection with France.† Here then we can see a sign of the Pope's nepotism as a factor, though by no means the chief one, in

Charles's desire, sent to the Pope. It is dated Barcinone, the 19th of February, 1518 (st. fl.), and concludes with the words: *Imperator orbi, imperatori V. S^{us} imperabit poteritque hoc uno facto et hostes ecclesie delere et ecclesiam felicissimam instituere. Cod. Vat., 6284, f. 52 *seqq.*, Vatican Library.

* NITTI's opinion is that Leo X. *always* looked to Francis' election as the only means to the desired end (153 *seqq.*). This does not seem to be consistent with the many unequivocal assertions of the Pope (*cf.* RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, I.² 383, n. 2). ULMANN also is of this opinion; because Leo, "since his knowledge of the Electors' prescription, regarded the elevation of Francis as unavoidable should Charles not succeed, and therefore took up his cause seriously" (*Studien*, II., 107).

† See the Letter of Bibbiena of the 16th (18th) of Feb., 1519, in *Manosc. Torig.*, XXV., 381 *seq.*

his attitude towards the rival powers. The temporal power of the Holy See, as a safeguard of its spiritual interests, was what Leo had most at heart. In the interests of this, together with those of Italian liberty, he could not tolerate that any overwhelming power should hold sway on the Italian peninsula. This object was, it is true, connected with his care for his own house, and for Florence, which was so closely united to the States of the Church; but these last were by no means the main object. In his unusually difficult position between the two great powers, the Pope tried as long as possible to veer about from one side to the other. When, however, he found himself driven by necessity to a choice between two evils, he saw in that connected with the French sovereign of Milan a lesser danger than that connected with the Spanish King of Naples.*

The Pope's preference for the French candidature was undisguisedly expressed in many ways. In the beginning of March the warm friend of France, Roberto Latino Orsini, Archbishop of Reggio, was sent, armed with Papal Briefs, to the German Electors, where, to the great satisfaction of Francis, he tried to work against Charles in every possible way.† On the 12th of March the Pope authorized the French King, by a special Brief, to promise the Cardinal's hat to the Electors of Treves and Cologne, should he be elected through their help. Two days later the Cardinal Archbishop of Mayence, Albert of Brandenburg, was,

* So says NITTI, 159 *seq.*; *cf.* ULMANN, Studien, II., 97, 107. Ulmann draws attention to the fact that "the imperial crown would not make Francis any stronger in what were formerly the imperial rights in Italy; whereas, on the other hand, the possession of that crown gave Rome a powerful weapon against the French claims on Naples."

† *Cf.* Reichstagsakten, I., 334, 374, 655, 685.

under the same conditions, promised the office of permanent Legate in Germany.* The significance of this last concession is uncertain. On the 21st of March the Pope expressed himself so decidedly to the Venetian Ambassador, that the latter was quite surprised. "His Holiness," reports Minio, "who has hitherto endeavoured to deceive both sides, has now put himself entirely on that of France, because he believes that he has more to fear from Charles than from Francis."†

If we call to our minds the character of Leo, who was ever most unwilling to take any part, who never came forward except in a case of utmost necessity, his open partisanship with Francis is most surprising. The ostensible object of driving a still more dangerous adversary out of the field is no adequate explanation of the Pope's action in the matter of the election of Francis I.; and it is only on closer observation, that we find the real reason why Leo entered the lists for the French candidate so much more openly and decidedly than at first. The reason lay in his increasing fear of being isolated. The thought that Francis and Charles might come to an understanding, pursued the prudent Medici Pope like a menacing spectre.

Therefore, on no account must France be given either pretext or opportunity of leaving the Pope to face Charles alone‡ and unaided. Should the King of Spain be elected, the Holy See must at anyrate keep a firm friend in Francis. That the rivals should come to an understanding must be prevented at all costs. Once he had committed himself to favouring Francis' cause, Leo's fear of

* See MIGNET, *Rivalité*, I., 171 *seqq.*; RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, I.² 363; and *Reichstagsakten*, I., 419-421.

† BROWN, II., n. 1179; BAUMGARTEN, *Politik*, Leos X., 564.

‡ NITTI, 171. (*Cf.* *Reichstagsakten*, I., 374-375.)

isolation drove him further and further along the road he had taken. On the 20th of April, he emphatically refused the request of the Swiss to leave the imperial dignity unhindered to the Germans. It was by no means his intention to depreciate the rights of the German nation; his opposition to Charles did not originate in that, but in the conviction that the Hapsburg, as occupant of the throne of Naples, had no right, by all the promises sworn to of old, to aspire to the imperial crown. It was his policy to adhere to Francis I., because from him the Holy See had no danger of that sort to fear.*

Soon afterwards the Pope, on his own initiative—for Cardinal Medici had, on the 3rd of May, gone to Florence to attend Lorenzo's death-bed—took a step by which he acted contrary to existing rules, and committed himself far more deeply than he had on the 27th of January.† A Brief, dated May the 4th, empowered Cardinal Cajetan, as Legate, in case three of the Electors should be unanimous in their choice of a candidate, to declare in the name of the Pope that such an election was valid.‡

In spite of the zeal which he was showing for the election of Francis, Leo X. still fostered his favourite plan of procuring the election of a third party, by choice the Elector of Saxony. His secret idea, that the great diplomatic struggle might be most advantageously settled in this way, was always recurring. The Roman court

* Eidgenössische Abschiede, III., 2, 1152 *seq.* Cf. Reichstagsakten, I., 569, n. 4.

† KALKOFF, Prozess, 409 *seq.*

‡ The Brief was sent through Francis I. to the Elector of Brandenburg; this important document was first published in the Reichstagsakten, I., 656–657, according to the French copy in the State Archives, Berlin. About the significance of the Brief, cf. ULMANN, Studien, II., 105 *seq.*; KALKOFF, Prozess, *loc. cit.*

adopted this project with such zeal that it was even willing to temporize about the matter of Luther.*

Meanwhile the Papal Envoys in Germany, having declared that, according to the constitutions of Clement IV., the King of Naples was ineligible for election to the imperial dignity, met with an angry rebuff from the ecclesiastical Electors, whose pride was severely touched. They protested against the unheard-of action on the part of the Pope in wishing to dictate to them about matters of election procedure.†

In the north of Germany matters seemed to take a turn more and more favourable for Charles. A popular movement in both Upper and Lower Germany rose in favour of the "broad ways" of the Hapsburg King. The Swiss also declared that they would not suffer the imperial dignity to pass from the hands of a German into those of a foreigner, least of all into those of the French, who had thirsted so long to possess it.‡

This intelligence reached Rome in the second half of April.§ Soon after this, there followed the death of Lorenzo de' Medici. He had been ill of the spleen ever since January. On the 13th of April a daughter—Catherine de' Medici—was born to him, whose birth cost her mother her life: on the 4th of May the father died.||

* KALKOFF, Prozess, 408 *seq.* Cf. Chapter VIII., *infra*.

† See GOLDAST, Reichshändel, 244; BUCHOLTZ, III., 670-671; Reichstagsakten, I., 519-520, 569; WEICKER, Stellung der Kurfürsten zur Wahl Karls V., Berlin, 1901, 144.

‡ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I.¹⁸ 669 *seq.*

§ Despatch of Costabili, April 18, 1519, in BALAN, VI., 19.

|| Cf. BALAN, VI., 20, and BOSCHETTI, I., 160; VERDI, 113 *seqq.* The rumour which was spread about that Lorenzo had been poisoned, which appeared in the contemporary Chronicle in V. Polit. L., f. 63 (Secret Archives of the Vatican) is without foundation.

The sad news* affected the Pope deeply, though he accepted the blow with Christian resignation. "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away," said he to his confidant, Pietro Ardinghello. As a Medici the event pained him deeply, but not as Pope; for he resolved to care for nothing henceforth except the exaltation and needs of the Apostolic See. So says the Mantuan Ambassador.† Another informant says that when he received the sad news Leo exclaimed: "Henceforward we belong no more to the house of Medici, but to the house of God."

From these expressions of self-accusation, on which such different judgments have been passed,‡ and his resolutions to renounce nepotism for evermore, it by no means follows that the Pope was conscious of having been hitherto guided solely by family interests. In them there is nothing

* The news reached Rome on May 5. PARIS DE GRASSIS, **Diarium*, Sec. Arch. Vat.; cf. rev. of Pastor's 'Leo X.' by CIAN, in *Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital.* XLVIII., 418 *seq.*, 426, n.

† REUMONT-BASCHET, Catherine de Médicis, 260. Cod. Vatic., 3190, contains the original copy of the document presented to the Pope himself: * "Ad divum Leonem X. Pont. Opt. Max. Petri Galatini Minoritani rev. dom, card^{lis} Sanct. quatuor coronator. capellani libellus de morte consolatorius in obitu ill. principis Laurentii Medicis ducis Urbini." The author observes that Leo accepted the deaths of Giuliano and Lorenzo with so much resignation that no symptoms of grief could be observed in him. "Quare non ut te consolaremur hec diximus sed ut singuli quique ex rationibus ipsis quas induximus animi tui fortitudinem cognoscentes exemplo tuo discant mortem non solum in bonis ducere sed eo quoque meliorem sepenumero esse quo celerior est ipsamque cum opus est omnino contemnere." In his learned treatise interlarded with many Greek quotations, the author wishes to show: (1) "mortem non malum, sed bonum esse; (2) eo plerumque meliorem esse mortem quo celerius acciderit; (3) mortem semper quandocunque venerit aequo animo ferendam esse." *Loc. cit.*, Vatican Library.

‡ Cf. BAUMGARTEN in *Forschungen*, XXIII., 567; NITTI, 209; ULMANN, *Studien*, 106-107.

beyond the acknowledgment that he had considered the aggrandizement of his relatives more than was fitting. All this he now changed. Consequently, the Duchy of Urbino, with Pesaro and Sinigaglia, were united to the States of the Church; Cardinal Medici received the management of Florentine affairs as Legate of the whole of Tuscany.* He remained in Florence till the autumn, when he left behind him as his representatives the Bishop of Pistoja, Goro Gheri, and Cardinal Passerini.†

Lorenzo's death certainly removed one obstacle to a change in the Pope's policy, though it did not conduce to a reconciliation with Charles. The chief reason of the change in his policy was the conviction that came to him that Francis' candidature was hopeless. On the 29th of May, Leo confided to the Venetian Ambassador that public opinion was so strong in Germany that the Electors could not choose the French King even if they wished it.‡

Nevertheless the Pope could not reconcile himself to the thought of Charles as Emperor, and reiterated through his representative that the King of Naples could not at the same time wear the imperial crown. At the beginning of June he made a last despairing effort to avert the evil, and finish the diplomatic strife by a means as yet untried, by

* B. Castiglione announced his appointment to the Marquis of Mantua in a *Letter dated May 27, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† The government of Urbino, which had been very bad under Lorenzo, was confided to Roberto Boschetti, who worked with Card. Medici in everything; BALAN, Boschetti, I., 162 *seq.* San Leo was separated later from Urbino and given to the Florentines as an indemnification for their expenses during the war against Francesco Maria. On October 12, 1520, Leo X. conferred Sinigaglia, Castelleone, San Lorenzo, and Montefoglio on Giovanni Maria da Varano, Lord of Camerino, as Vicar of the Holy See; see BALAN, Boschetti, I., 172, and Storia, VI., 21.

‡ BROWN, II., n. 1227.

proposing the candidature of the Elector of Saxony. On the 7th of June an urgent message was sent to Frederick through the Papal representative and the French Ambassador, pressing him to support Francis; or, if that were impossible, to accept for himself the imperial crown. If the Elector of Saxony could add but two more votes to his own, the Pope promised to confirm his election, and support him by every means in his power.*

At the time that Leo X. made this proposal, the resentment of the Germans against all the friends of France had reached such a height that the lives of the latter were not safe.† Through the leader of the French party, the Archbishop of Treves, the Pope learned that four of the Electors were determined on the election of Charles. On his own confession, this intelligence convinced Leo of the futility and danger of holding out any longer for Francis' candidature.‡ He must at last accept the inevitable. For his part Charles neglected nothing which could win Leo's favour; while Francis, just at this juncture, committed the blunder of making a most offensive demand of the Pope. According to the report of the Ambassador of Este, on the 5th of June, a letter arrived from the French King warning the Pope against incorporating Urbino in the States of the Church, seeing that the Duchy belonged to the infant Catherine de' Medici, whom the King regarded as his own daughter.§ That this demand caused a revolution in the mind of the Pope is certain, for he made

* See Reichstagsakten, I., 822 *seq.*, as well as KALKOFF'S important amplifications, Prozess, 413, note 3, and 417 *seq.*

† To save his life, the Papal Nuncio, Orsini had to escape by night from Mayence, disguised. BREWER, III., n. 299; Reichstagsakten, I., 782; *cf.* 777.

‡ Leo owned this to the Ambassador of Henry VIII. See Arch. stor. Ital., App. I., 324.

§ The despatch of A. Paolucci, June 5, 1519, in BALAN, Storia, VI., 20.

his final decision in the middle of June. Just then most important news came from Germany; Caracciolo reported that, though ill, he had had himself carried in a sedan-chair to the Archbishop of Mayence, to implore him, in the Pope's name, to consider the good of the Apostolic See and promote Francis' election. The answer of the Archbishop was to the effect that under no circumstances would he vote for the French King.* At the same time Leo was told that the Elector of Saxony had written a letter, dated the 8th of June, in which "with all courtesy as to form, but incisively and plainly," he had dismissed both Papal representatives.†

These tidings caused the abrupt change in the Pope's attitude. On the 17th of June an understanding was come to with the Spanish Ambassador, Caroz, by which Leo X. agreed, for this once, to the union of the imperial crown with that of Naples, conditional on a Papal veto of the expansion of the power of Spain in Lombardy or Tuscany.‡ On this, the Pope's representatives in Germany were instructed to make out a new treaty embracing the new concession, and word was at once sent to the Electors that, if they wished to elect Charles, they need not be deterred by considerations about the crown of Naples.§ Thus, at the last moment—for the Electors were already assembled at Frankfort—Leo X. gave in, in face of the probability, nay, more, the moral certainty, that the election of the Hapsburg King would take place, whether the Pope consented or not. Such a

* Cf. SANUTO, XXVII., 413-414; BROWN, II., n. 1239; KALKOFF, Prozess, 419.

† Reichstagsakten, I., 765 *seq.*, 832 *seq.*; KALKOFF, Prozess, 415 *seq.*

‡ See NITTI, 211 *seqq.* Cf. ULMANN, Studien, II., 107-108. The agreement, which is published complete in Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVI., 218 *seqq.*, was not confirmed by Charles V.

§ BUCHOLTZ, III., 672.

grave injury to the dignity of the Holy See must be averted at all costs! That he gave in under compulsion there can be no doubt. He himself admitted as much when he wrote to Cardinal Cajetan saying that it was useless for him to knock his head against a stone wall.*

Francis also saw at last the futility of any further effort to win the crown. On the 26th of June he withdrew his own candidature, and told his Envoys to work for the election of Joachim of Brandenburg. A second letter, written the same day, instructed them that, should the Archbishop of Treves be in favour of the Elector of Saxony, the latter was to be supported. On the 21st of July the Nuncio Orsini, by the Pope's directions, once more, through Karl von Miltitz, urged Frederick of Saxony either to vote for Francis, or else to stand himself for election.† But Frederick positively refused either course, and declared himself in favour of Charles. On the 28th of June, 1519, the grandson of Maximilian was unanimously chosen King of Rome. Although, until he was crowned by the Pope, this was the only name he was entitled to bear, he was thenceforward generally spoken of as the Emperor.

The outcome of the long diplomatic struggle was regarded with deep interest. This is borne witness to by Baldassare Castiglione,‡ who came to Rome on the 26th of May to condole with the Pope on the death of Lorenzo de' Medici.§ The members of the Curia had been con-

* BROWN, II., n. 1257.

† Reichstagsakten, I., 822 *seq.*; *supra*, p. 285.

‡ Cf. *Letter of Castiglione to the Marquis of Mantua, dated from Rome, June 3, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ *Heri sera che fu giobbia alli 26 del presente gionsi qui. To-day he had an audience and offered his condolences to the Pope. *Letter to the Marquis, dated from Rome, May 27, 1519. Cf. **Letter to the Marchioness on May 28. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

vinced that neither Charles nor Francis had any chance ; nor were the French as certain of victory as they had been,* though there were still individual Frenchmen who spoke very vauntingly. The general fear was that a grave war would ensue. The Pope alone was of a different opinion as to this,† and went undisturbedly about his usual pursuits, while excitement, which expressed itself in a number of wagers, rose to fever height in the city.‡ On the 1st of July the news that Charles had been elected spread throughout Rome ; whereat the imperialists rejoiced greatly.§

The definite news of Charles's election reached Rome on the 5th of July, being celebrated by great rejoicings on the

* *Letter of June 5, 1519, in Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. See Appendix, No. 44.

† *Dui giorni sono che Monsignor de Concorseau . . . mi disse che senza dubio alchuno el suo Re sarebbe Imperatore. Presto se ne sentirà el scoppio. Universamente se extima che habbia ad essere gran guerra, ma N. S. mostra di essere d'altro parere e prometto pace. *Letter from Castiglione, dated from Rome, June 16, 1519.

‡ . . . *Qui si sta d'hora in hora in aspettatione di udir la nova dell' imperatore et in banchi se danno de molti ducati in questa mèssa. N. S. sta sano, è molto alegro e sta su piaceri consueti suoi. Heri sera che fu la vigilia S. Giovanni se fecero jochi per Roma benche questa non è festa consueta di Roma ma di Firenze. Castiglione to the Marchioness on the 28th of June, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ *Qui se sta in continua expettatione del nuovo imperatore e quattro giorni sono se levò per tutta Roma una fabula che el Catholico era fatto imperatore di modo che Ceccotto pianto su la sua casa in Borgo una grandissima arma del predetto Catholico con le insegne imperiali e fece venire da otto o diece trombetti che tutto el di non fecero mai altro che sonare e fece porre su la strada due botte de vino e diede bere a chi ne volse tanto che se consumò tutto sempre dicendo villania a quelli che dicevano che la nova del Catholico non era vera : presta se saprà s'egli è buon propheta o astrologo. Castiglione to the Marquis on July 4, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

part of the Spaniards, Imperialists, and the Colonna. The cry, "The Empire and Spain!" rang through the streets of the Eternal City.* Baldassare Castiglione says that "the joy of the Spaniards is as difficult to describe as the depression of the French, who go about like men dead."† The Spanish Cardinals and prelates and all those who held benefices in Naples and Spain took part in the uproarious rejoicings. On two evenings five or six hundred Spaniards, well armed, with music and banners, paraded the streets, stopping in front of the dwellings of the Spanish prelates, where they were given wine and money. The Germans in Rome took offence at the cry of "Spain! Spain!" set up by these men, whereas they would have preferred that of "Austria!" or "Burgundy!"‡ Thereupon more Spaniards and their adherents mustered in Rome, as though they were the masters of the Eternal City.§ The consequence of all this was a very painful scene between the Pope and Caroz, the Ambassador of Charles.|| Leo X. could not conceal the deep impression made on him by the election of the Hapsburg. "Ambassador," said he to Minio, the representative of Venice, "had the French King acted according to our advice, a third party would have

* Cf. Paris de Grassis, HOFFMANN, 427. *Diary in Cod. Barb., 3552, Vatican Library.

† *Qui non si po dire el iubilo che sentono questi Spagnoli de la creatione del novo imperatore et el dispiacere degli Francesi che stanno come morti. *Letter to the Marchioness, July 13, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

‡ **Report of Castiglione, July 14, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

§ Cf. NITTI, 236.

|| Cf. the **Report of Castiglione, Aug. 31, 1519. How the Emperor pacified the Pope, who was so highly incensed that he spoke of excommunicating Charles (**Letter of Castiglione, Sept. 10, 1519), is described by Castiglione in his **Report of Sept. 17, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

been elected. God grant that the election of Charles may conduce to the good of Christendom!"* Such an exclamation shows how set Leo had been in his secret heart on the candidature of the Elector of Saxony.†

A few days later Minio found the Pope thoughtful and anxious. "What shall I do," said he, "if the Hapsburg comes to Italy now? All Germany will back him up!" On the 18th of July the Venetian Ambassador found him still more agitated, because, as he complained, the French were laying all the blame on him for what had happened about the election. "As you know," said he to Minio, "I did everything that they wished, and this is the result!"‡

Next day the Pope communicated to the Cardinals assembled in Consistory the contents of a letter from Charles, in which, briefly and moderately, he announced his election, and professed his good-will, and submission to the Holy See. The Pope did not fail to make use of this opportunity to commend Charles for not having assumed prematurely the title of King of Rome, though powerful enough to assert his claim to it.§

* SANUTO, XXVII., 453. Cf. BROWN, II., n. 1247.

† KALKOFF, Prozess, 426. Owing to the unfavourable result of the election, Cajetan fell into disgrace, if not with Leo, at any rate with the influential Cardinal Medici. Cf. KALKOFF, Forschungen, 110 seq.

‡ BROWN, II., n. 1250, 1257. Cf. SANUTO, XXVII., 476, 483.

§ Cf. *Acta Consist., July 19, 1519, the reading of Charles's letter. "Quibus lectis laudataque regis virtute et modestia, quod titulum regis Romanorum sibi minime ascripserit, decretum est, ut sequenti die missa papalis celebraretur gratieque Deo optimo maximo pro tam singulari dono agerentur." (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.) On the 24th of June Castiglione reports as follows to his Marquis: * "Venne l'altro giorno uno gentiluomo di Spagna mandato in poste dallo imperatore a fare intendere al papa come haveva havuto nova dalli electori di essere creato imperatore e cosi se offeriva a N. S. molto amplamente. S. S.^{ta} fece fare congregatione de tutti li cardinali e fece eggere la lettera

Only now * were the customary festivities celebrated in due form.† On the 16th of August a letter containing the good wishes of the Pope was sent to Charles,‡ the fine-sounding and bombastic phrases of which could have blinded only the very ignorant to the fact that Leo anticipated with a great fear the attitude likely to be taken by the new Emperor.

dello imperatore et ordinò li fuochi li quali la sera se fecero con gran triumpho." Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

* Cf. the **Reports of Castiglione of July 14, 1519. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

† Paris de Grassis in HOFFMANN, 429 *seqq.* ; BROWN, II., n. 1260 ; BALAN, VI., 22, n. 1.

‡ RAYNALDUS, 1519, n. 29-30. BAUMGARTEN (Karl V., I, 174) quotes the Brief from a manuscript, and when doing so perceived accidentally that it had been already printed in 1519, in a rare document. It is scarcely conceivable how Baumgarten could have overlooked the impress easily accessible to Raynaldus.

CHAPTER VII.

THE OCCASION AND CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY.—THE CONTEST ABOUT INDULGENCES.

I.

WHEN Leo X. was wise enough to withdraw his opposition to the election of Charles V., even though at the eleventh hour, he saved the dignity of the Holy See from considerable injury. When, however, he thus avoided an open conflict with the new Emperor he did not, apparently, grasp the full importance of his prudent action in respect to the far-reaching religious revolution which was then seething in Germany.* From the promulgation of an indulgence, unimportant in itself, there rapidly sprang up and spread throughout the whole Empire, a storm against Rome which made the Papacy tremble to its foundations.

The man who let loose this storm was a figure of which history affords but few examples. For four centuries the picture of his character has been in varying forms before the minds of men; and at the present day there is less agreement in the opinions formed of him than at any former period. On one point, however, friend and foe may join hands, and that is as to the strong personality of Martin Luther. It is true that he alone did not bring about the revolt which was to rend the unity of the Western Church for so many centuries. Nevertheless, it is true that he contributed more than any other to the subversion

* NITTI, 224-227.

of existing conditions, though, as a matter of fact, he only put the match to the inflammable heap which had been accumulating for centuries.

The death-throes of the Middle Ages show to an attentive observer not only a remarkable growth in the religious sense and life,* but also in that of grave moral and religious evils. We find light and darkness mixed to an unusual extent among the people, taken as a whole. The most characteristic and glaring contrasts of the time are to be found among the clergy, both secular and religious.† Alongside of the most joyous self-sacrifice and inspired love of God and man, we find tokens of unbridled self-seeking, covetousness, luxury, and immorality. To

* Besides the exhaustive statements of JANSSEN (I.), see the profound and remarkable deductions of R. WACKERNAGEL in the *Baseler Zeitschr. für Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, II., 171 *seq.* Cf. BEZOLD, *Gesch. der Reformation*, 90 *seqq.*; STIEVE in the *Allg. Ztg.*, 1892, suppl. 46; A. O. MEYER, 37 *seq.*, 53 *seq.*; MÜLLER, *Kirschengesch.*, II., 1, 159, 163 *seq.* In the review of the last-named work (HARNACK'S *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1898, 442) Deutsch remarks: "We have here an indication of the conditions of that period, which conduces to a right understanding of the actual circumstances, which silently corrects the views held by the old Protestants in their naive way of looking at things, seeing only stray gleams of light in the prevailing darkness, as well as the optimism of the prejudiced new Catholics." In consideration of its scientific utility, Janssen, in the eighteenth edition of his first volume, takes the dark side into very full account. Many Protestant critics have acknowledged this. In my next edition of Janssen, I will speak of the opinions of HASHAGEN on the subject (*Westdeutsch. Zeitschr.*, XXIII., 102).

† The following is founded on the amplifications which I have introduced into the eighteenth edition of JANSSEN (I., 681-743); see there for further illustrations and examples. Among the works referring to this are A. O. MEYER, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Reformation aus schlesischen Quellen* (*Histor. Litbl.*, XIV., Munich, 1903). For a criticism of this profound work, see SCHÄFER, *Bemerkungen*, in the *Rom. Quartalschr.*, XVIII., 105 *seqq.*

many of that time the evils seemed so great that they feared the judgments of God.*

One cause of the downfall of the German Church lay in her enormous riches, the unhealthy growth of which aroused on one side the envy and hatred of the laity, and on the other had a most deleterious effect on the ministers of the Church themselves. The worst feature of all was the inducement offered by this wealth to nobles of all degrees, to use the Church as a means of providing for themselves, by turning to their own advantage ecclesiastical stipends, especially those of canonries and prebendaries. The misuse of such incomes reached back as far as the beginning of the 13th century, though it did not become universal until the beginning of the 15th century. The natural consequence of this was that an increasing number of nobles embraced the ecclesiastical state for the sole purpose of obtaining possession of some sinecure. Through these noble ecclesiastics, who often, while quite young and before binding themselves by any vows, received various benefices connected with cathedrals, a spirit of worldliness, love of pleasure, and covetousness crept into the chapters. The cases of scandal given by these young ecclesiastics by their immoral conduct were only too frequent, and the general characteristics infused into the chapters made it only too probable that they

* *Onus ecclesiae*, c. 40. Cf. DENIFLE, *Luther und Luthertum*, I., Mayence, 1904, 4. WERNER'S opinion (*Die Flugschrift Onus ecclesiae*, Giessen, 1901), that the author of the remarkable work (*Onus ecclesiae*) was Bishop Berthold Pirstinger, does not seem to CLEMEN to be borne out by the reasons given (*Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXXVIII., 362). In the work, written in 1519, and printed with anti-Lutheran interpolations in 1524, it seems as if the author were a member of a religious order. HEIDHUES (*Annalen d. histor. Vereins f. d. Niederrhein*, LXXIX., 193) believes that a Carthusian of Cologne, perhaps Johannes Justus von Landsberg, was its author.

would offer but little or no resistance to the impending religious revolt, and would even welcome it, provided it did not interfere with their monetary interests.

The monopoly of the cathedral benefices by the nobility had a further effect most fateful for the German Church. The episcopal sees were as a rule held by nobles, who saw in the sacred office nothing but a source of power and wealth. The dangers always attendant on the position of Bishops as landowners were thus doubled. The danger had been increased since the middle of the 15th century by the contest between the princely families and the knighthood of the Empire, with the result that the episcopal sees were occupied in an increasing ratio by the scions of princely houses. Though there were always honourable exceptions to the prevailing decadence, still the purely secular element increased steadily among the Bishops, who devoted their large incomes to the holding of luxurious courts, and in taking part in the quarrels and feuds of their families, while they left the duties of their office to be performed by their suffragans. On the eve of the revolt from the Church, many were the complaints made by earnest and upright Catholics against the worldliness of the Episcopate. But nowhere was a stronger protest made than in the remarkable work, "*Onus ecclesiae*." *

"How often," says this book, "does the choice fall on a good, virtuous, and learned Bishop, and how often on one who is inexperienced, carnal, and ignorant of spiritual things? Prelacies are for the most part obtained by evil methods and ambition, not by election or other lawful means. The Church is brought into danger by these methods of conferring spiritual offices. Where is the Bishop who at the present time preaches or troubles him-

* *Onus ecclesiae*, c. 20. Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 701 *seq.*; WERNER, 23 *seq.*

self about the souls entrusted to his care? Seldom do we find a chief pastor who is content with one church, and does not hold several benefices, even trying to appropriate more than one see. Moreover, Bishops care more for the table than for the altar, and while they are ignorant about theology they love worldly knowledge. Rather are they temporal lords than servants of Christ. They adorn their bodies with gold, but bespatter their souls with dirt. They are ashamed of their spiritual ministrations, and seek their fame in worldly vanities. In defiance of ecclesiastical laws they surround themselves with immoral persons, court fools, and frivolous companions. Sometimes they have recourse to worthless theologians and artful lawyers who, being moved by covetousness, bend the law like wax whichever way suits them, and flatter them while they keep silence about the truth. As to the accursed chase to which the Bishops devote themselves in a most scandalous fashion, I say nothing. Furthermore, the Bishops are always looking out for war, they whose calling it is to promote unity and peace. I know some prelates who prefer to wear the sword and weapons of soldiers than the spiritual garb of their state. Thus it happens that the episcopal revenues are spent on this world's possessions, sordid cares, stormy wars, and worldly dominion. They do not even exercise charity, but neglect the poor of Christ, while they fatten their dogs and other beasts, as though they would become like to them. To such as these might Christ most justly say: I was a stranger and poor, and you did not take me in; therefore depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire. Nearly all the Bishops are covetous, take what belongs to others, and squander the property of the Church. They devote to other purposes what they ought to use for the service of God and of the poor. They do not use the revenues of the Church for

holy purposes, but spend them on their relatives, play-actors, flatterers, huntsmen, bad women, and such like persons. Even the inalienable possessions of their sees are given by them unlawfully to their relatives, to whom they hire them out at a nominal interest, to the detriment of their churches, the ruin of justice, and the great oppression of the poor. Such prodigals ought to be numbered among heretics. Provincial and diocesan synods, though prescribed, are not held. Consequently many ecclesiastical matters which ought to be amended are neglected. Besides this they do not make visitations in their parishes at stated times : yet they do not forget to charge them with heavy taxes. For these reasons religion languishes in both laity and clergy, and the churches are unadorned and falling into ruin. If a visitation is made, the Bishop troubles himself rather about its temporal concerns than about those that are spiritual ; though he quite neglects to see that the funds of the parish are looked after by suitable persons."

Even if the author of this work, led away by his zeal for reform, generalizes too much on the abuses, it is established by the testimony of other good and earnest men that in the latter days, before the great revolt from the Church, her chief pastors were in many places in a very bad moral state. The possession of most of the episcopal sees by the sons of princes and nobles, who neglected their duty, and were as a rule no better than their equals in the world, and the neglect in the chief pastoral office which this involved, had as its consequence the general moral depravity of the secular and regular clergy, as well as of the laity. Without this the sudden secession from the Church and from the faith of their fathers, of such an enormous portion of the German people, would remain inexplicable, however favourable might have been the circumstances that led to the great subversion.

Several of the Popes of the 13th century had fought

against the monopoly by the princes and nobles of the benefices and sees of the Church in Germany. But, with these exceptions, the Holy See not only countenanced but even encouraged the fatal abuse. Worldliness and a confusion of ideas had assumed such proportions in the Curia that, at the dawn of the 15th century, they seemed to have lost all idea of the fatal influence which the secularization of the Episcopate must have on religion. Even one so sagacious as Æneas Silvius de' Piccolomini, when defending the Roman See against the accusations brought against it by Martin Mayr,* reckons it as among the merits of the Curia that it raised the sons of princes to the episcopal sees, as had happened lately at Treves and Ratisbon. "For," he says, "a Bishop of princely estate is far more likely than one of lower degree to promote the interests and importance of the Church, and preserve her rights." Looking at things from the point of view of the leading humanists, he reproaches men of lower estate for desiring to be Bishops as soon as they had acquired some learning. He laments, moreover, that the element of the lower nobility, whose noble descent it is not always so easy to prove, should have such a preponderance in the cathedral chapters, Cologne and Strasburg excepted, that these were not inclined to select the sons of princes to occupy the sees, lest they should have a Bishop whom they would have to obey. It does not seem to have occurred to the intellectual Sieneſe that it was not merely a high position which was required to make a good Bishop, but, primarily, the necessary moral qualities.

At the end of the second decade of the 16th century, when the revolt against the Church began, not only were

* De ritu, situ, moribus et conditione Germaniæ descriptio, in Æneæ Sylvi Piccolomini Opera, Basileæ, 1571, 1045. With this compare Vol. II. of this work, 421 *seq.*

a great number of archiepiscopal and episcopal sees occupied by the sons of princes,* but several of these princely Bishops, such as Albert of Brandenburg, held, with the sanction of the Pope, two or more bishoprics.

In marked contrast to the higher clergy, who luxuriated in their rich revenues, the lower clergy, who had the cure of souls, had no fixed salary, and depended for subsistence on uncertain tithes and stole-fees. From poverty, though sometimes also from covetousness, they had recourse to methods of gaining money which were incompatible with their state, and could not fail to draw down on them the contempt of the people.† Among those things which led to this lamentable state of things, the first to be considered is the enormous number of the lower clergy. Although the multitude of religious foundations for Masses bears striking testimony to the piety of the Middle Ages, there existed a dark side in the shape of the quantity of small benefices which were the result. These afforded their occupants neither enough to live on nor enough to employ them. The consequence was that there was a superfluity

* Cf. the epitome which I have given in JANSSEN, I. 18, 703.

† It was partly this struggle for a maintenance to which were due the wide spread of the *Missae bifaciatae* and *trifaciatae*, and that travesty of the Holy Sacrifice the *Missa sicca*, in which there was neither consecration nor communion. For these and other excrescences in the service of the Most High, cf. the profound book of A. FRANZ, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, Freiburg, 1902, 77 *seqq.*, in which a rich and interesting material is worked up in the most excellent manner. The learned author, however great stress he may lay on the numerous abuses, refrains from all unjust exaggeration or over-dark colouring. He rightly asserts that all these abuses did not outweigh "the deep faith and holy zeal with which the people knelt before the altars, and signified but little in comparison with the fulness of the stream of grace which flowed from the Sacrifice of the New Testament over millions and millions of faithful hearts."

of clerics attached to the parish churches in the larger cities and smaller towns, as also to the cathedrals. It stands to reason that where the number was so excessive it was not everyone who had a vocation to the spiritual state; nor can it be doubted that even if the vocation existed, there was nothing like enough work for all.*

Parents at that time had so little conscience that they destined for the priesthood and religious life those of their children who were unfitted to make their way in the world; and this for the sole reason of providing for them. These lamentable circumstances, combined with lack of occupation, absence of a true vocation, and want of theological training, conduced to the immorality of many of the clergy.† Even when a good and worthy Bishop was found to fulfil his duty, it was difficult, if not impossible, under the circumstances, for him to maintain the necessary discipline. In the condition of the Episcopate as described above, any abuse could spread unhindered.

The complaints in the 15th century as to the immorality and concubinage of the clergy are very numerous. But we must always remember that many of the expressions used by preachers and moralists are manifestly exaggerated,‡

* To the literature I have specified in JANSSEN, I., 18, 704, *seq.*, there can be added BERTRAM, *Gesch. des Bistums Hildesheim*, I., Hildesheim, 1899, 487 *seq.*; PRIEBATSCH in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XXI., 54 *seqq.*; A. O. MEYER, 24, 30 *seq.*, 33, 36 *seq.*; HASHAGEN in the *Westdeutschen Zeitschr.*, XXIII., III., *seq.*, and SCHÄFER, *Die Kirchlichen, sittlichen und sozialen Zustände des 15. Jahrhunderts*, after Dionys. Carthus., I.: *Das Leben der Geistlichen* (Diss.), Tübingen, 1904.

† Cf. in general the extract "vom Geistlichwerden," in Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff*, JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 706.

‡ The author of *Onus ecclesiae* also falls into this fault when he says (21, 9): "In Alemania me hercle pauci sunt curati qui non foetore concubinatus marcescunt." WERNER, 27.

and that it stands to reason that more is said about evil and depravity than about what was regular and normal.* Nor must it be overlooked that there existed in the Church in Germany righteous and serious-minded Bishops, who held synods and carried on a constant warfare—and not always without results—against immorality and other scandals. There were, moreover, whole districts, such as the Rhine country, Schleswig-Holstein, and the Allgäu, where, as we learn on good authority, the clergy for the most part led irreproachable lives.† Still there was a superabundance of what was evil. The condition of the clergy was very bad, especially in Franconia, Westphalia, Bavaria, in the Austrian territories, especially the Tyrol, in the diocese of Constance, on the Upper Rhine, and in nearly all the large towns‡ There was a spiritual proletariat which extended over a large area, and formed a constant danger to the Church, being ready at any moment to attach itself to whatever movement promised to injure her.§

Luxury was combined with immorality among the clergy in a higher position. "The clergy," says a contemporary, "are to be found in inns and taverns, and at sports and theatres, more frequently than in consecrated places." These debased tastes were rightly attributed to the abuse of the rights of patronage by both spiritual and lay persons, who often preferred to advance bad and uneducated

* WACKERNAGEL as to this (*loc. cit.* 269) very pertinently remarks : "What we find described in the chronicles is not the normal condition, but that which is scandalous. The official acts speak chiefly of individual occurrences ; as for literature and satires, we can take them only in a certain sense as a historical testimony."

† See the testimony in JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 709.

‡ *Ibid.* I., 18, 710 *seq.* About Westphalia, see HASHAGEN in the *Westdeutsch. Zeitschr.*, XXIII., 114 *seqq.*

§ About the tendency towards deterioration in the secular and religious clergy, *cf.* DENIFLE, *Luther and Luthertum*, I., Einl.

priests in preference to the worthy. Contemporaries mention pride and covetousness as the sins which drew down most hatred on the clergy. Even those who were in other respects better men, were a prey to covetousness. Complaints were made that even the educated clergy did not devote themselves to their sacerdotal duties, and cared only for the financial advantages of their sacred office.* The love of money showed itself in all grades of the clergy by their efforts to raise as high as possible the manifold ecclesiastical taxes and revenues, in hunting for and accumulating benefices, in nepotism, and in simony. Another evil custom which was the outcome of covetousness, was that of serving benefices vicariously, by placing substitutes to serve the rich cures in which they did not care to reside in person. While they were living in affluence and frequenting the courts of princes and nobles, their office was supplied by scantily-paid vicars.

The Popes of the 15th century must incur blame by the manner in which they entrusted the offices of the Church to the unworthy and incapable, and by their facility in granting dispensations for holding a plurality of benefices, without the obligation of living on them. It is obvious how bad must have been the effect of this granting by the Popes of one preferment after another to the greedy benefice-hunters who flocked in thousands over the Alps. The hatred felt for these courtiers was general.† All this contributed to fostering a widespread and deep

* *Onus ecclesiae*, c. 23. Cf. WERNER, 29 *seq.*

† WIMPHELING has portrayed the "Romipeta" in his *Stylpho* (lately republished by HOLSTEIN, *Lat. Literaturdenkmäler*, VI.). Cf. KNEPPER, *Wimpheling*, 35 *seq.*; cf. 197 *seq.* About the German courtiers in Rome, see KALKOFF, *Aleander*, 131 *seq.* As to the great part played in the "grievances" of the German nation by the giving of benefices for a purely financial reason, see A. O. MEYER, 70 *seq.*

discontent with the actual condition of ecclesiastical affairs, the displeasure being extended to the Pope himself.

Still more injurious was the deviation from their original purpose of the old episcopal seminaries for the training of the priesthood. The universities could serve the purpose as far as the cultivation of theological knowledge was concerned, but were no adequate substitute as places of spiritual training, because they were frequented by only a small portion of the clerics. Thus, alongside of the higher and educated clergy there existed among the lower clergy a number of ignorant and uneducated men who, as Trithemius complains,* did not trouble themselves about the study of Holy Scripture, and often had not even mastered the Latin tongue. But, as in the case of other reproaches, such accusations must not be generalized on. The very activity of men like Trithemius, Wimpheling, Geiler von Kaisersberg, and others, who spoke so strongly against abuses, shows that alongside of the many bad elements in the Church of Germany there was much that was good. Even such a severe censor of the clerical offences of the time as Johannes Nider, is explicit in his warning against exaggerated generalizations;† because in every condition of life the good and the bad lived alongside of one another, though more attention was invariably paid to what was bad than to what was good. In the same way that there were excellent Bishops as well as those who were unworthy, so all over Germany there were good and conscientious priests among the secular clergy and in the religious orders. This is incidentally pointed out by Wimpheling, who is often so bitter in his

* De vitæ sacerdotalis institutione. Cf. SILBERNAGL, Trithemius, 24 *seqq.*

† Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 721.

judgments.* At the outbreak of the Reformation it was shown that, alongside the multitude of unworthy priests and monks who, from lack of theological training and discernment, and especially from moral neglect, flocked to embrace the Lutheran heresy, there always remained a number of learned priests of high moral character who stood true to the Church, at the cost of personal sacrifice and even danger.

To form any general judgment as to the condition of the religious houses in Germany at that time, is therefore peculiarly difficult, owing to the lack of individual research. The number of religious houses was enormous. Even those who are most ready to admit the value of the religious state must lament a certain superabundance of religious foundations. The circumstances were, however, very different in individual cases, and the abuses, though undoubtedly numerous, must not be generalized on. The religious orders of that time produced many upright and worthy priests, and this was all the more important, because the greatest part of the work for souls was in the hands of the mendicant friars. The monasteries, moreover, did a great deal to relieve the social needs of the people. Even if grave abuses did exist, nearly everywhere there could be seen signs of a strong reaction against the prevailing corruption. The attempts at reform in the monasteries date from the end of the great Schism of the West, and were at first accomplished under great difficulties. There were four great and successful streams of reform in the religious orders: that of the Benedictines (Bursfeld Congregation), the Canons Regular (Windesheim Congregation), and the Augustinians and Franciscan Observantines.

Stress must be laid on the fact that after Martin V.,

* At the conclusion of his work, *De arte impressoria*, in JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 438 *seq.*

nearly all the Popes were zealous in the cause of the reform of the religious orders of Germany, both generally and in individual cases.* Above all, we must remember the important work done by the Cardinal-Legate, Nicholas of Cusa, in Germany and the Netherlands, and his monastic reforms in the year 1451.† Pius II. also did a great deal, comparatively speaking, for the reform of the monastic houses in Germany, especially by his patronage of the Bursfeld Congregation and the reform of the Franciscan Observantines.‡

The results of the monastic reform varied greatly, and the sharpest contrasts could be seen in every field. The circumstances in different countries and different Orders varied very much. In Upper Germany the attempt to reform the mendicant friars met with the fiercest opposition. In Lower Germany, just at the critical time of the Lutheran revolt, the Saxon province of Luther's own Order, the Augustinians, had so degenerated that, in 1521, it broke away as a whole, and, with the exception of a few members, followed the new religion.§

As a rule it was the richest cloisters and abbeys which had fallen furthest from their original spirit, and which were most strongly opposed to any attempt at reform. Wealth had the same baneful effect on them as it had on the Episcopate and cathedral chapters. It tempted the nobles, who saw in the Church only a means of provision for their

* About Martin V., *cf.* Vol. I. of this work, 229 *seq.*; about Eugenius V., *ibid.*, 356 *seqq.*

† *Cf.* the detailed account, Vol. II. of this work, 105-133. See also BLOK, II., 560 *seq.*

‡ *Cf.* PASTOR, Vol. III. of this work, 279 *seq.* About Paul II., Vol. IV., 109 *seqq.*; about Sixtus IV., Vol. IV., 406; about Julius II., Vol. VI., 445 *seq.*

§ *Cf.* DENIFLE, Luther und Luthertum, I., 351 *seqq.* See also BLOK, II., 564 *seq.*

sons, and regarded religious houses as made to be appropriated for their own ends. They made it, moreover, their business to guard these emoluments from the encroachments of the burgher and peasant class, who were already excluded from the higher ecclesiastical positions. The German nobility in this way drew great odium on itself. Rich abbeys served practically as "hospitals for the nobles," in which those were placed by preference who were unfit for the world. Even the lame and blind were placed in them without any regard for a religious vocation. Such elements introduced an entirely worldly spirit into the cloister; nor did it end there. Thus did these religious houses decline more and more from their fervour. Many of the inmates went about in the world just as they pleased, and were not even required to return. In fact, contemporaries complain that cloisters and consecrated places became mere pleasure resorts.* These noble communities were the most dissolute and most opposed to ecclesiastical reform.†

All this was equally the case in the houses of religious women. Many of these stood in most evil repute. It was therefore no matter for surprise that these dissolute religious passed over wholesale to the new religion, broke their vows, and threw to the winds everything which had hitherto been most sacred to them.

But if a considerable portion of the clergy and religious were disposed to embrace a doctrine such as Luther's new gospel, which so entirely suited their inclinations, the contempt and hatred of the laity for the degenerate clergy was no mean factor in the great apostasy. While the

* *Onus ecclesiae*, c. 22; WERNER, 27 *seq.*

† *Cf.* the numerous examples in JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 725-732. The exemptions granted from episcopal jurisdiction had the very worst effect, by hindering even zealous Bishops in their attempts to restore discipline in religious houses.

great mass of the lower orders clung for a while with fidelity to the Catholic Faith, the educated classes showed the strongest antipathy to the degenerate clergy, and from them the same spirit of opposition spread to the lower classes. More and more general became the indignation felt with those Bishops who lived like secular princes, who were better versed in the arts of war than in the duties of their sacred ministry, and who did not even reside in the dioceses the revenues of which they devoured. The scandalous manner in which many of the higher clergy paraded their wealth acted as a challenge to criticism. In the episcopal towns of the Rhine Provinces there were serious quarrels and open rupture between the burghers and the clergy, and in other places there were scandalous conflicts between the Bishops and their subjects.*

The desire of acquiring wealth and property which possessed some of the religious houses, to the injury of people outside, was also very injurious to the cause of the Church. Envy drove the laity to generalize on individual cases of this kind, and detest all the clergy without distinction.† Hatred and contempt were levelled against those degenerate monks who were accused of having entered the cloister merely to feast and gormandize at the expense of their poorer fellow-citizens. A spirit of bitter enmity against the clergy is expressed in the various revolutionary writings of the 15th century.‡ Of these, the "Reformation of the Emperor Sigismund" appeared at the time of the Council of Basle. Afterwards appeared "The Reformation of Frederick III.," written in the last quarter of the century; and the most radical of all in the work, lately discovered, of a revolutionary of the Upper Rhine,

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 734 *seq.*

† Cf. *Onus ecclesiae*, c. 28; WERNER, 37.

‡ Cf. the information in JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 736 *seq.*

written in the first decade of the 16th century.* In this book, which contains the darkest possible and most grossly exaggerated picture of the condition of ecclesiastical, public, and social affairs, an attempt was made to radically revolutionize all departments, and secularize all Church property.

Together with the dissatisfaction with the clergy, there grew up a deep-seated and often bitter hostility to the Pope and the Roman Curia. This spirit of opposition showed itself not only among the princes and burgher class, but was strongest of all among the clergy of both the higher and lower ranks. In this lay the greatest danger for the Papacy ; "for with a discontented clergy rested the power at any moment of drawing the simple folk into apostasy." †

There were many degrees and different currents of opposition to Rome in Germany, between which a distinction must be drawn. The great Schism of the West, which began in 1378, not only caused much confusion by its long duration, but, as a natural consequence, gave a severe blow to Papal authority.‡ The fact of the dual Papacy could not fail of itself to have this effect. To this must be added the great dependence of the Popes on temporal princes, caused by the Schism. In order to increase, or even keep the obedience due to them, the Popes saw themselves compelled to make important and far-reaching concessions to the temporal powers, unless they were willing to put up with arbitrary interference in the ecclesiastical domain, and submit to the extension of sovereign rights at the expense of spiritual authority.

* Made known by H. HAUPT in "A Revolutionary of the Upper Rhine of the time of the Emperor Maximilian I." (*Ergänzungsheft 8, Westdeutschen Zeitschr. für Geschichte und Kunst*), Treves, 1893.

† Such is the view taken by JANSEN, *Maximilian I.*, 15.

‡ Cf. Vol. I. of this work, 138 *seqq.*

Thus did the great Schism lastingly and fatefully prepare the way for the apostasy of the 16th century. A further consequence of this destructive confusion of the dual Papacy was the obscurity which it cast over the doctrine of the divine institution of the Primacy, and the monarchical character of the constitution of the Church.*

A party sprang up in the Church which placed the authority of a General Council above that of the Pope. Even ecclesiastically-minded theologians who acted in the interests of the Church, brought forward various theories having this tendency. A sweeping system of the kind was propounded by the eminent German theologian Heinrich von Langenstein in a work written by him in 1381, advocating the assembly of a "Council of Peace."† Another German theologian, Conrad von Gelnhausen, developed this new theory in his "Einigungsbrief" in 1380. In France Langenstein's principles produced a strong effect on the celebrated John Gerson. Though with those who were sincere the movement was promoted with the honourable object of healing the Schism, the council theory took with others a form of radical opposition to the authority of the Supreme Pontiff. Doctrines were propounded which denied the divine institution of the Papacy and the unity of the Church. A copious German literature testifies to this anti-Papal current. The best known of these books is the passionately violent "*Confutatio primatus Papae*," by the Saxon Minorite, Matthias Döring, based on the "*Defensor pacis*" of Marsilius of Padua.‡ After the Council of Basle,

* Cf. Vol. I. of this work, 179 *seqq.*

† *Ibid.*, 182 *seq.*

‡ Cf. P. ALBERT, *The Confutatio primatus papae*: its Source and Author (*Histor. Jahrbuch*, II., 1890, 439-490); by the same, Matthias Döring, *Ein deutscher Minorit des 15 Jahrhunderts*, Stutgard, 1892. Cf. Vol. I. of this work, 80 *seq.*, II., 47.

which was so fatal in its result to the holders of the Council theory, and after the Vienna Concordat of 1448 a change in many respects for the better came over the so-called conciliar movement, which was apparently relegated to the background even in Germany. But though smothered and hidden, the anti-Papal movement was by no means destroyed; though kept out of sight, it was in reality more effective even if less visible and on the surface.*

During the pontificate of Callixtus III. a movement in Germany, hostile to the Papacy, sprang up under the leadership of the Archbishop of Mayence, Dietrich von Erbach. The Primate of the German Church, in union with the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, strove to promote the assembly of a great national Council, with the object of obtaining the recognition of the decrees of the Council of Basle and of procuring the redress of the so-called "grievances" of the German nation. But under their parade of reforming zeal these prelates were in reality seeking their own advantage.†

The anti-Papal movement in Germany became more violent and dangerous under Pius II. To prove this it is sufficient to recall the attitude of the Archbishop of Mayence, Diether von Isenberg (a type of the secularized Episcopate), and the disorders in the Tyrol under Duke Sigismund.‡ The polemical writings of Gregor Heimburg in the interests of the Duke were of a violence almost unprecedented.§ On the other hand, Andrea Zamometić's

* Cf. Æneas Silvius in his letter to Pope Nicholas V., Nov. 25, 1448; Vol. II. of this work, 60; and JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 740.

† Cf. Vol. II. of this work, 413-418.

‡ Cf. Vol. III. of this work, 164 *seq.*

§ *Ibid.*, 188 *seqq.*

hazardous attempt under Sixtus IV. to promote the assembling of a Council was of but slight importance.* Of the same nature were the schismatic attempts of Maximilian I. under Julius II.,† which were completely frustrated.

The secularization of the Roman Curia, which reached its zenith under Alexander VI., had a bad effect on the loyalty of the Germans to Rome, and caused great dissatisfaction in those who were eye-witnesses of it.‡ Nevertheless, any thought of a real secession from Rome found no place among the masses of the German people. In all their complaints the duty of obedience to the Pope was expressly maintained. The grievances brought against the Roman Curia,§ and the other causes of dissatisfaction alluded to, did not in any way touch the Faith, but were directed solely against abuses which could be remedied without severing Germany from the centre of ecclesiastical unity. Such abuses referred to the proceedings of canon law, to the Roman practice of administration, especially in the granting of benefices, and the method of taxation through the Papal courts. In many cases the grievances were so completely justified that upright, ecclesiastically-minded men, warmly attached to the Holy See, admitted them. If the Curia was able to make so many unjustifiable encroachments in Germany, it was because it did not find itself face to face with a powerful and united government, such as it met with in England and France. The breaking up of the Empire into a number of greater and lesser territories almost invited encroachment, and "the Curia, which had so many methods at its command, always had

* Cf. SCHLECHT, Andrea Zamometič, I., Paderborn, 1893, and Vol. IV. of this work, 358-363.

† Cf. Vol. VI. of this work, 354-357.

‡ *Ibid.*, 151.

§ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 741 *seqq.*; II., 18, 170 *seq.*

some German princes at its back, even if others were opposed to it.”*

The dissatisfaction with Rome was made more acute and virulent by the introduction of the national element, expressed by a bitter hatred of the Italians, whom the Germans charged with underrating their nation, and for caring only for what could be gained from them. This dislike was felt equally by men devoted to the Church, such as Berthold von Henneberg, Archbishop of Mayence, and wild radical spirits of the type of the revolutionary of the Upper Rhine, who to their boundless contempt united the bitterest hatred of Rome.†

But in addition to an antipathy of this kind, which had no dogmatic tendency and was directed solely against the real and supposed abuses in the ecclesiastical government, heretics arose in the 15th century—largely in connection with the heresy of Hus—such as Johann von Wesel, who was called before the Inquisition at Wesel in February, 1479, and had to recant his false doctrines.‡ The Bohemian Brethren, who denied any distinction between priests and laymen, and called the Pope Antichrist, began at that time to propagate their doctrines in Germany. Their eight different confessions of faith were printed in the German tongue in Nuremberg and Leipzig.§

Ecclesiastical grievances had been much increased in Germany by political, legal, and social abuses. The study of German history shows an increase in the decay of the Empire ever since the 13th century, and as a consequence of

* JANSEN, Maximilian I., 25 ; *cf.* 11.

† *Cf.* JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 743.

‡ *Cf.* CLEMEN in the *Zeitschr. für deutsche Gesch.*, N.F., II. (1897), 143 *seqq.* ; also PAULUS in *Der Katholik*, 1898, I., 44, and in the *Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theol.*, XXIV., 645 *seqq.*

§ *Cf.* JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 747.

this the sovereignty of the princes had become confirmed.* The long reign of Frederick III. had been especially injurious to the power of the Empire, and to its position in the eyes of Europe. The injury wrought by him was so great that later on even a distinguished ruler like Charles V. could not, in spite of the gain of a few temporary results, succeed in reducing the unsettled state of things to order. From the time of Frederick III. the princely houses, which had always in later times had a greater or lesser influence on the history of the German people, were firmly established at the expense of the imperial power, while only certain sovereign rights were allowed to the Emperor. The introduction of Roman law, which ever since the 13th century had been slowly supplanting the native German law, was of the greatest moment in this political development.† The princes who were striving by its help to establish their power and sovereignty were its most eager promoters. Dating from the middle of the 15th century, a change, unknown before, had been introduced into the government of the territories belonging to spiritual as well as temporal princes; and all the more important court and civil offices were held by Roman jurists,‡ and the principles of Roman law were introduced in every branch of government. In place of the older mode of self-government belonging to the German law, bureaucracy prevailed, which interfered with and controlled everything, burdened the people to the utmost of its power, quite regardless of the violation of their ancient rights. "According to the abominable theory of Roman jurisconsults," says Wimpeling,§ "the prince is everything in the country, and the

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 504 *seqq.*

† *Ibid.*, 548 *seqq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, 570 *seq.*

§ De arte impressoria, 27^a. Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 570.

people nothing. The people have to obey, pay taxes, offer their services, and, above all, obey not only the princes, but also their officials, who are beginning to assume the functions of the real lords of the country, and arrange matters so that even the princes have next to nothing to do with the government." Taxation, above all, was promoted by the Roman jurists. The application of Roman law to this had the most injurious effects, and the result of the action of the jurists as advisers to the territorial lords, was the degradation of the peasantry, who, under the dominion of the new law, were outraged, oppressed, and ground down on every side. The effects of Roman law extended into every phase of the life of the people, bringing about the subversion of all actual conditions.*

To this extension of the power of the princes—in the sense of that of the old Roman patricians—was due the fact that they aspired to dominion in the spiritual domain as well. Long before the outbreak of the Reformation, many jurists had come to the conclusion that princes might claim ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and, after the example set by the ancient Roman Emperors, "regulate even religious matters, institute and deprive Bishops, and appropriate Church property as their right, to be turned to the use of the State."† In the same way that Charles the Bold of Burgundy was instructed by his jurisconsults that he himself should be Pope in his own dominions, so the German territorial lords held the opinion that they might claim Papal rights in their own lands. To the existing desire to appropriate Church property, there was now added a desire on the part of the German princes to usurp the spiritual jurisdiction of the Bishops. Many events, especially in the second half of the 15th century, show the way in which the proprietors of

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 571 *seq.*, 576 *seq.*

† *Ibid.*, 18, 577 *seq.*

land usurped jurisdiction in purely spiritual matters, and acted as if they were the lawfully constituted spiritual authorities.* Sometimes the abuses which had crept into some monastery gave the desired excuse for the interference of lay authority, and monastic reformers, such as Johann Busch,† called in the help of the secular arm of the nobles for the restoration of order. In individual cases, where the temporal prince in question was religiously-minded, such a usurpation of spiritual rights might seem to be of small importance. But in the case of most German princes such an interference was not prompted by any desire for the purity of the Church, but was solely the assertion of the punitive office which had been claimed by them since the middle of the 15th century. German landed proprietors assumed rights in respect to the Church in an increasing ratio. Such as these were the "taxation of the Church, the limitation of her right to acquire property by loan, the exercise of the State *placet*, immoderate interference in the appointment of Bishops and other ecclesiastical officials, the right of visitation, and supervision of ecclesiastical matters in their own territories."‡

The waning authority of the Pope and the weakening of the imperial central power by the increase of territorial influence—both a result of the great Schism—had the unhealthy effect of severing Church and State, to the injury of the former. The new State Church, as is

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 728 *seqq.*

† *Ibid.*, 726 *seqq.*

‡ See V. BELOW in the *Hist. Zeitschr.*, LXXV., 53. Cf. FINKE, *Kirchenpolitik Verh.*, 5 *seq.*; BEZOLD, 88 *seqq.*; PRIEBATSCH in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XIX., 397 *seqq.*, XX., 159 *seqq.*, 329 *seqq.* (XXI., 43 *seqq.*, for the beginning of the interference of the State in ecclesiastical affairs); EICHMANN, *Recursus ab abusu*, Berlin, 1903, 76 *seqq.*; and SRBIK, *Staat und Kirche in Oesterr.*, Innsbruck, 1904.

shown by the history of the 16th century, contained the gravest dangers for the unity of the Church. In the increase of the power of the princes there lurked an easy and safe excuse for despoiling the Church, not only partially, but, in a certain sense, completely, by perfecting the revolt and seceding from Rome. Under this new development a disposition was infused into the lower and oppressed classes to join in every movement of revolt, provided only it were subversive of the authority of State and Church.

The humanism of Young Germany was the most important of the movements which threatened danger to the Church.* It was totally different both in nature and effect from that of the older humanists. Whereas the latter school looked at things from the point of view of Christianity, at the service of which they placed classical antiquity as an important factor of culture, in the humanist school of Young Germany the study of antiquity was its own end, and often evinced a spirit not only indifferent, but often hostile, to Christianity. The real founder and type of the younger school was Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam. A great scholar but a weak character, a man of brilliant attainments, by the many-sidedness and versatility of his active mind, Erasmus exercised by his numerous writings a prodigious influence on his time.† In spite of all the services he rendered to classical study, it must be admitted that, though he never separated himself openly from the Church, Erasmus did much by his attacks, not only on degenerate scholasticism but on scholasticism itself, as well as by his venomous irony, to lessen respect for the authority of the Church and for faith itself among a large number of

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 78 *seqq.*, 744; II., 18, 3-39.

† *Ibid.*, II., 18, 7-25. Cf. KALKOFF in *Archiv für Reformations-gesch.*, I. Jahrg. (1903-4), 1 *seqq.*

the highly-cultivated men of the day. Thus did he prepare the way for the impetuous and impassioned Luther.

The influence exercised by Erasmus over the younger school of humanists was portentous. While on the one hand he filled his disciples with a one-sided enthusiasm for classical antiquity, and a contempt for the ecclesiastical science of the Middle Ages (about which he knew but little), he brought discredit on the study of philosophy. He accustomed the susceptible youth of the day to despise serious, scientific, and speculative research, and regard rhetoric, witty speech and the art of style as the first requisites of education. Jakob Locher, surnamed Philomusus, well known as the translator, editor, and expounder of the ancient classics, and also as the author of text-books of classical philosophy, was now in the field with his lawless views of life, and had taken his stand as the disciple of pure paganism purged from all Christianity. He recommended the ancient poets, even the most objectionable, as the best, nay, only means for the education of youth.

With the second decade of the 16th century complaints were entered against the abandonment and depreciation of philosophical studies, against the one-sided and exclusive study of the classics, as well as against the presumption and immorality of the younger humanists. In 1512 Johannes Cochläus made the following protest: * “Philosophy is set aside; some devote their lives to *belles lettres*; others, without fitting preparation, take up the study of law; while others again throw themselves into the study of medicine merely for the sake of gain: all this being to the injury of the student. Humanist studies, however much they may conduce to the ornamentation of learning, are injurious to those who have no solid scientific training. Hence the levity of certain persons, to whom the name of

* *Meteorologia Aristotelis*, s. Aij, in OTTO, Joh. Cochläus, 26.

"poets" is erroneously given. Hence the buffoonery and the criminally scandalous lives of some. They are the common slaves of Bacchus and Venus; not the pious priests of Phœbus and Pallas."

The younger humanists considered themselves qualified to look down with contempt on "the old barbarians" who busied themselves with scientific and dialectic questions; because, without any profound study of the spirit of the ancients, they had acquired a certain facility in handling their form of speech, and, by a superficial imitation, could fabricate worthless verses. Those humanist productions, which take in vain the name of the Most Holy and treat of Christian things as of a mere play of the mind, are particularly unsavoury and revolting. Of this kind were the "Christian Heroids," in imitation of Ovid, which were published in 1514 by Eobanus Hessus. More original, though shameless and coarse beyond words, were the "poets'" imitations of the old erotic poets; for in these their mode of life was in harmony with their verses. Even as in the movement of the Italian Renaissance the idea of sensual pleasure was let loose in the most unbridled manner,* so was it now with many of the younger humanists such as Locher, Hermann van dem Busche, and Ulrich von Hutten. They fell into the wildest extravagances, if for no other reason than to show their superiority to the Italians.

Conrad Mutianus Rufus, by his influence over the humanists of Erfurt, of whom he was the leader, was responsible for the mixture of Christianity and paganism in the movement.† This canon of Gotha, who had been in Italy a warm adherent of Neoplatonism, then rampant among the humanists, was for a time at least an opponent of positive Christianity. His definition of that religion was antagonism

* Cf. Vol. V. of this work, 135 *seqq.*

† Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 30 *seqq.*

to the Mosaic system, and humanitarianism quite independent of revelation, while, together with his followers, he had nothing but scorn and contempt for the Church and her institutions and doctrines. Guided by such an influence, a frivolous literature sprang up in Germany, the key-note of which was enmity to the Church and the spiritual state: above all, it poured its scorn on the religious orders. It is no wonder that such doings eventually caused among many earnest men of strong ecclesiastical leanings an antipathy towards humanistic studies in general, and that the religious orders and scholastic theologians were especially zealous in their opposition to the "poets," as the representatives of an unchristian learning, often exceeding all reasonable bounds in a one-sidedness which, under the circumstances, was intelligible. Mutianus was one of the most impassioned of the anti-scholastics, and described the fight of the humanists against scholasticism as "a fight of light against darkness." His one ambition was to annihilate the old school and all its institutions.

A characteristic type of the younger humanists of Germany was the gifted but morally-depraved Ulrich von Hutten.* Having been early imbued at Erfurt with the tenets of a completely pagan sect of humanists, he became there the champion of a proletariat of nobles, who had nothing to lose by the subversion of the existing state of things. He was possessed of an unbounded self-confidence which made him regard himself as the chosen supporter of the movement of the new era; so that everything he did or tried to do was in his eyes of history-making importance. All this, combined with his ability and gift of writing, made him one of the most dangerous promoters of revolutionary ideas. Towards the Church and her doctrines and institutions, his attitude was one of

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 56 *seqq.*, 101 *seqq.*

unmixed scorn and repugnance. In 1513 he returned from his first sojourn in Italy the avowed enemy of the Papacy, against which he declared open war.

The dispute between Reuchlin and the theologians of Cologne, gave an impetus to the open war between the younger humanists and the representatives of the older school of learning. Johann Reuchlin,* who had a natural inclination towards the Church, and was much esteemed in Germany for his personal qualities as well as for his knowledge of Greek, and still more of Hebrew, had become imbued with the doctrines of a fanatical theosophy, induced by his study of the Jewish Kabbala, and encouraged by his own propensity for mystical subtleties. He expressed his opinions in two books, "Vom wundertäligen Wort" and "Über kabbalistische Kunst." Reuchlin was far from wishing to injure the Church by these theories; he thought rather that they would bring about a better understanding of Christianity by throwing new light upon it from the Jewish books. But in reality his views were calculated to sow confusion in the brains of the youth of Germany, and give an impetus to the inclination, already existing among them, to cast themselves adrift, at the expense of Christianity, from all dogmatic teaching. Several theologians spoke with disapprobation of Reuchlin's writings, and Jakob Hochstraten, a Dominican of Cologne, wrote an answer in 1519.

The outcome of these literary publications was a long dispute about the authority of the Jewish books. Johann Pfefferkorn, a baptized Jew of Cologne, in his zeal for the conversion of his former fellow-believers, had arrived at the conclusion that the chief cause of their obstinacy would be removed if they were compelled to give up all the Talmud

* See GEIGER, J. Reuchlin, Leipzig, 1871. Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 116 *seqq.*; II., 18, 41-56; PAULUS, Die deutschen Dominikaner, 94-102.

books in their possession. Pfefferkorn demanded this in several works, written in the years 1507-1509, and it was solely due to his efforts that an imperial mandate was issued on the 19th of August, 1509, commanding the Jews to produce before him all books opposed to the Christian Faith and their own law. He obtained permission to take away such books and destroy them in any place in the presence of the parish priest and two members of the Council. In a later mandate of the 10th of November, 1509, the Emperor gave the conduct of the whole affair to Uriel, the Archbishop of Mayence, who was commissioned to obtain the opinion of the Universities of Cologne, Mayence, Erfurt, and Heidelberg, together with that of the converted Jew Victor Carben, of Reuchlin, and of the Inquisitor Jakob Hochstraten. The judgment of Reuchlin was not in agreement with the severity of the others consulted, for he considered that only the manifestly scandalous books of the Jews should be destroyed, after lawful sentence had been passed; though he opined that all the other books should be detained. However, the whole affair came to nothing, as the Emperor would come to no decision.

The question of the Jewish books gave rise to a dispute which was most important to the religious and spiritual life of the nation. Immediately, it was a purely personal quarrel between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn, who thought he had been insulted by the other. But it went further; Pfefferkorn avenged himself by the impassioned pamphlet, the "*Handspiegel*" (1511), in which, without any ground to go on, he accused Reuchlin of having been bribed by the Jews. Reuchlin replied even more violently by his "*Augenspiegel*," which was published during the autumn fair at Frankfort, 1511. This book caused the greatest sensation in Germany, and was sent by the chief parish priest at Frankfort, Petrus Meyer, to Hochstraten, the

Inquisitor of the province of Mayence. The two theologians Arnold von Tungern and Conrad Köllin were charged by Hochstraten with the examination of the book. Reuchlin at once exerted himself to obtain a favourable verdict. The first pronouncement on either side, calmly made, seemed to justify such an expectation. But, soon after, the strife broke out afresh, and Reuchlin, in a second pamphlet published in 1512, stood by what he had said before, and attacked the Frankfort theologians. Arnold von Tungern replied in a temperate Latin book, while at the same time Pfefferkorn attacked his adversary in his "Brandspiegel." Reuchlin, embittered by the censure passed by the Emperor Maximilian on the 7th of October, 1512, on his "Augenspiegel," published (1513) a "Defence against the Cologne Calumniators," which is one of the most frantic libels of the age. On the 9th of July 1513 the Emperor ordered its suppression. After this the theological faculties of Louvain, Cologne, Mayence, Erfurt, and Paris pronounced the condemnation of the "Augenspiegel." Hochstraten, as Inquisitor, opened the trial, and in September, 1513, called Reuchlin before his tribunal at Mayence. Reuchlin now appealed to the Pope, and by means of a flattering letter gained the advocacy of the physician of Leo X., the influential Jew, Bonet de Lattes.* Leo X. handed over the case to George, Bishop of Spire. This prince, only twenty-seven years of age, and little versed in such matters, passed on the decision to Canon Truchsess, a disciple of Reuchlin. Against his verdict, which exonerated the "Augenspiegel" and censured Hochstraten for condemning it, the Inquisitor appealed to the Pope, who this time appointed as judge Cardinal Grimani. The latter summoned both parties to Rome in June, 1514. Hochstraten was bidden to appear in person, but Reuchlin,

* Cf. GEIGER, 297.
VOL. VII.

on account of his advanced age, was allowed to send an advocate to represent him. Hochstraten had started for Rome even before the summons reached him; but the affair dragged on year after year, for Reuchlin had many influential patrons at the Curia, and the Pope forbore from any interference.

Leo X. suspected no danger, though there were not wanting those who warned him. Even as early as the 21st of April, 1514, the learned Adrian of Utrecht, afterwards Adrian VI., appealed to Cardinal Carvajal and begged him to do his best to persuade the Pope to be prompt to heal "this cankerous disease." Shortly afterwards the Cologne theologians appealed to the same Cardinal. They, and above all the Inquisitor, had remained faithful to their duty in respect of the heretical "Augenspiegel," and, being supported by the verdict of various Universities, had condemned and burnt the book. Whereupon its author obtained, by a false statement, the appointment of a new judge at Spire. He, "being more inclined to error than to Catholic truth, and being ignorant both of theology and the mysteries of faith," was bold enough to acquit the book, "to the injury of the Catholic Church, the joy of the Jews, the detriment of the Universities and their scholars, and the grave and harmful scandal of the common folk." Hochstraten had appealed to the Holy See, and implored Cardinal Carvajal to help him, by doing which he would be maintaining the holy faith; "for if," said he, "the frivolity of the poets (*i.e.* the humanists) be not suppressed in this affair which is polluting faith, they will in the future be less diffident in attacking theological truth." *

But on both sides of the Alps rich patrons of Reuchlin's appeared, who were able to postpone a decision. Even the

* GEIGER, *loc. cit.*, 305.

Emperor Maximilian interested himself on his behalf. Erasmus also spoke warmly to the Pope in favour of his friend.* But, on the other hand, the Archduke Charles, afterwards the Emperor Charles V., put in a plea for Reuchlin's adversary. With words of warning he approached the Pope in 1515. "Corruption," said he, "will grow every day that the decision of this case is postponed. In Rome, where the trial is held, nothing is discussed except the form in which the question is put, while the substance of it is neglected. A few Cardinals are charged with the examination of the matter, whereas, on account of its importance, the affair ought to be laid before the Cardinals assembled in the Council which was then sitting in the Lateran. Would that the strife could be ended! Would that the cruel wolf could be prevented from shedding the innocent blood of the sheep, and this scandal be removed from the path of the weak!" Francis I. also had warned the Pope, and begged him to speedily make a happy decision about the matter, conforming himself in this with the judgment passed by the German schools, and "our University of Paris." The University of Louvain, in a letter sent to the Pope, said that it looked on it as a sacred duty to care for the order and purity of the Catholic Church. In the condemnation of Reuchlin's book, Louvain had agreed with the other faculties, especially that of Paris. "All who walked in the house of God had spoken unanimously."†

Yet no decision was given! When the Roman commission, the majority of whom favoured the "Augenspiegel," declared themselves ready to express their final opinion, a Papal mandate, dated July, 1516, was issued, which deferred a decision. This did not make Hochstraten

* GEIGER, 309 *seq.*

† *Ibid.*, 310-312.

desist from his efforts. For another year he remained in Rome, and it was only in July, 1517, after more than three years' sojourn there, that he returned to Cologne without having succeeded in his object.*

While Rome hesitated, affairs on the other side of the Alps had taken a menacing turn. The younger humanists, now firmly united for the first time, made use of the Reuchlin dispute in their rebellion against the authority of the Church, and especially against the doctrines of the Dominican Order, as being to them the chief representative of scholasticism. Under the leadership of Mutianus, who, moved merely by theological antagonism, took the side of Reuchlin against his convictions, the younger humanists gathered round the latter and stirred him up to greater fury than before against his opponents, while they poured forth scorn and satire on the theological teaching of the old school. In the years 1515-1517 the Letters, published under the title of "*Epistolae obscurorum virorum*," appeared. The first part of them was written by Crotus Rubianus, and the second entirely by Hutten.† The writers of this work did their utmost to defame their adversaries by the grossest accusations. The real motive of this shameful libel was hostility to the authority of the Church. A number of the letters in the second part are dated from Rome. It was Hutten who extended the line of attack, and made war directly against the Holy See.‡ What the humanists did now in respect to Reuchlin, they repeated when soon afterwards they espoused the cause of Luther, whose first confederates they became.

The outbreak of the Lutheran movement and the attitude of the humanists towards Reuchlin at last caused

* GEIGER, 319-320.

† BRECHT, *Die Verfasser der epist. obsc. vir.*, Strasburg, 1904.

‡ Cf. PAULSEN, *Gesch. des gel. Unterrichts*, I., 2, 84.

the latter's case to be regarded in Rome in a less favourable light ; the trial terminated in a way unfavourable to him. But the Papal decision came too late ; in the long interval of hesitation, Reuchlin's name had been taken up as a war-cry by all the adversaries of the Holy See. In his final verdict, Leo X., on the 23rd of June, 1520, declared the Spires judgment to be invalid, forbade the circulation of the " Augenspiegel " as a book offensive, scandalous, and unlawfully favourable to the Jews. Moreover, he condemned Reuchlin to pay all costs of the trial. At the same time Hochstraten was reinstated in his offices of Prior and Inquisitor, of which he had been shortly before deprived by the Frankfort Chapter, intimidated by the threats of Sickingen.*

The Reuchlin dispute, thus decided all too late by Rome, was the forerunner of a far more important contest, which was to bring about a final parting of the ways.

II.

When we look at the condition of things connected with the Church in Germany at the close of the Middle Ages, we can see that, even if by no means hopeless, it was such as to cry out urgently for reform. It is true that the Church stood firm with strong vitality ; it is true that faith and piety waxed strong among the masses of the people in spite of the excesses in the lives of both secular and regular clergy. Nevertheless there existed smouldering elements, the letting loose of which was bound to lead to a catastrophe. There was an abundance of inflammable material ready laid in the field of politics and society, and above all in that of the Church, and there were only wanting the right man and the given opportunity to cause a disastrous conflagration. Both were at hand.

* GEIGER, 447 *seq.*, 451.

That the outbreak of the revolt against Rome should be connected with a financial question was by no means fortuitous; for in Germany at that time there was no subject of complaint more rampant than the constant demands for money made by the Curia, and the grave abuses connected therewith. The Papal tax-gatherers had always filled a difficult position in that country. To the nation's innate sense of liberty there was united a general reluctance to recognize any taxes, whether legal or ecclesiastical.* Ever since the development of political economy had facilitated financial dealings with Rome, the complaints against the covetousness of the Curia had become so violent as to lessen the respect felt for the Holy See. "Every person subjected to a demand for money gave vent to his displeasure, without considering that the Papacy, being a universal institution, must have the right to turn to the faithful to help it to defray its expenses."†

As a matter of fact, discontent with the Curia's system of taxation, which was carried on by all its chief agents, was shown as early as the 13th century, and ere long passed all bounds. In the 15th century complaints were openly made by the Germans about the way in which their country was impoverished by the large sums of money which were for ever flowing into Rome. The complaints of some, as for instance Martin Mayr, were made with a vicious intention, and were meant to frighten the members of the Curia and secure a good price as hush-money.‡ But others, upright and devout Catholic chroniclers, brought forward the same accusations.§ That

* KIRSCH, *Die päpstlichen Collectoren während des 14 Jahrhunderts*, Paderborn, 1895, Einl.

† JANSEN, Maximilian I., 12.

‡ Cf. Vol. II. of this work, 418.

§ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 742.

there was much exaggeration in them cannot be doubted ; and the latest researches show the necessity of caution in accepting the current opinion. One of the most distinguished investigators pertinently declares that a closer knowledge of the Papal system of taxation will prove to be its apology ;* which shows how much must remain uncertain in the present state of research. But whatever may be the final verdict passed, it is certain that it was the general opinion in Germany that, in the matter of taxation, the Roman Curia put on the pressure to an unbearable degree.

The covetousness of Rome in its worst developments, connected especially with trade, money-changing, and gratuities, was the favourite theme of the most bitter satires. Again and again was the complaint made that chancery dues, annates, *medii fructus*, and consecration fees were unduly raised or unlawfully extended ; that numerous new indulgences were published without the consent of the Bishops of the country, and tithe after tithe raised for a Crusade and diverted to another object.† Even men devoted to the Church and the Holy See, such as Eck, Wimpheling, Karl von Bodmann, Archbishop Henneberg of Mayence, and Duke George of Saxony, shared in the dissatisfaction, and often declared that the German grievances raised against Rome were, from a financial point of view, for the most part only too well founded.‡

Added to the grievance about the tithe for the Crusade, it was a standing source of displeasure that each year the promulgation of indulgences became more and more a mere money transaction, which led to many abuses. Even

* FINKE, Kirchenpolitik. Verhältnisse, 110.

† GEBHARDT, Gravamina, 112 *seq.*

‡ See the authentic records in JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 743. Cf. KNEPPER, Nationaler Gedanke, 71, and Wimpheling, 256 *seq.*

under Julius II. this grievance was attacked by Ulrich von Hutten.*

At the court of the Medici Pope no account was taken of the deep-seated dissatisfaction caused by the Roman demands for money. With inconceivable thoughtlessness no attempt was made to leave the old beaten track. Quite regardless of the innumerable complaints which were lodged against it, the little official world lulled itself to sleep in false security. Misgivings expressed by a few individuals passed by unheeded. Nothing was allowed to disturb the prevailing satisfaction in the actual state of ecclesiastical affairs. That the Germans should inveigh against Rome was such a matter of course that no particular attention was paid to their outbursts.† The chronic need of money, a consequence of disorganized finances and the Pope's boundless expenditure, led Rome to have recourse to the most perilous methods. The most reckless means of filling the always empty coffers were resorted to without misgiving. Vainly did Aleander in 1516 tell Leo X. that he much feared a revolt against the Holy See, on the part of Germany, for that thousands were only awaiting their opportunity to speak out their mind most openly.‡ But no heed was paid to the warning voice, and, in the face of the growing fermentation, the Pope committed the unpardonable error of proclaiming an indulgence for the building of the new basilica of St. Peter's, on an even more extensive scale than that proclaimed under Julius II.

* STRAUSS, I., 99 *seq.* The abuses attendant on the publishing of indulgences occupied the theological faculty of the University of Paris in 1518; see DELISLE, *Notices sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la fac. de théologie de Paris*, Paris, 1899.

† An utterance of SIGISMONDO DE' CONTI (II., 291) is deeply characteristic of this state of mind.

‡ See BALAN, n. 31; BRIEGER, n. 11.

According to custom, Leo X., on entering on his pontificate, had revoked all the indulgences granted by his predecessor. He made, however, one exception, and declared his intention of not revoking that which Julius II. had granted for the furtherance of the erection of the new church of St. Peter's. As on former occasions, the Franciscan Observantines were charged by Leo X. with its promulgation in their respective provinces. No new field was opened in this proclamation, so that it applied neither to Portugal, France, Burgundy, nor to any German territory except Austria, nor to the Bohemian part of Silesia.* But at the end of 1514 all this was changed. On the 29th of October, the St. Peter's Indulgence was extended for one year to Savoy, Dauphiny, Provence, Burgundy, Lorraine, and to the town and diocese of Liège. On the 2nd of December it was further extended for two years to the ecclesiastical provinces of Cologne, Treves, Salzburg, Bremen, Besançon, and Upsala. The intermediate dioceses were exempt; the exceptions being the possessions of Albert, Archbishop of Mayence and Magdeburg, and Administrator of the diocese of Halberstadt, those of the Margrave of Brandenburg, as well as the dioceses of Cambrai, Tournai, Théroutanne, and Arras. Giovanni Angelo Arcimboldi, a member of a Milanese family and court prelate, was named commissary for indulgences in this new field.† At the end of September, 1515, Arcim-

* *Cf.* PAULUS, Tetzl, 26; SCHULTE, Fugger, I., 57 *seq.* The Swiss, P. Falk, wrote from Rome in 1513 saying that new indulgences were very hard to obtain, because of the fear that the St. Peter's Indulgence might be injured by them; see *Anz. für schweiz. Gesch.*, N. F., XXIII. (1892), 376; *cf.* 378. About the difficulties made by Leo X. when the Venetians in 1517 solicited new indulgences, see SANUTO, XXIV., 105, 448.

† *Regest. Leonis X.*, n. 12,385, 13,053, 13,090. **Brief to the Archbishop of Cologne, Dec. 15, 1514, in State Archives, Düsseldorf; *cf.* PAULUS, Tetzl, 28 *seq.*; SCHULTE, I., 63-65. Some details of

boldi's powers were extended to the diocese of Meissen. At Easter, 1516, he named as his coadjutor the Dominican, Johann Tetzel.* When, at the end of 1516, Arcimboldi went north, Tetzel entered the service of the Elector of Mayence, Albert of Brandenburg, to whose dioceses of Mayence, Magdeburg, and Halberstadt an indulgence had been granted, the proclamation of which was to lead to events, the import of which was little suspected.

Albert of Brandenburg,† Archbishop of Magdeburg since August 1513, and, since September of the same year, Administrator of the see of Halberstadt, was, for political reasons, elected as Archbishop of Mayence on the death of Uriel von Gemmingen on the 9th of March, 1514. But Albert was resolved to retain the other two sees as well, the result of which would be an accumulation of bishoprics the proclamation of the indulgence in the Netherlands by Arcimboldi are given in the treatise of P. FREDERICQ, *La question des indulgences dans les Pays-Bas au commencement du XVI^e siècle*, in the *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres*, 1899, 24-57; and *Les comptes des indulgences en 1488 et en 1517 à 1519 dans le diocèse d'Utrecht*, in the *Mémoires couronnés et autres mémoires publiés par l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, LIX. (1900); cf. also the report of PAULUS in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXI (1900), 139, 846, and PAQUIER, Aléandre et la princ. de Liège, Paris, 1896, 53 n. 1. About Arcimboldi's proclamation of the indulgence in the north of the Empire, see Vol. VIII., chap. 10.

* Regest. Leonis X., n. 17,844; PAULUS, Tetzel, 29.

† Cf. J. MAY, *Der Kurfürst, Kardinal und Erzbischof Albrecht II., von Mainz und Magdeburg*, 2 Bde, Munich, 1865-75; SCHULTE, *Fugger*, I., 93-141. Added to these the revised edition of Schulte's works by SCHRÖRS in the *Wissenschaftl. Beil. zur Germania*, 1904, Nos. 14, 15; PAULUS in *Der Theol. Revue*, 1904, No. 18, and PFÜLF, in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LXVII. (1904), 323 *seq.*; also KALKOFF, *Zu den römischen Verhandlungen über die Bestätigung Erzbischof Albrechts von Mainz im Jahre, 1514*, in *Arch. für Ref. Gesch.*, I. (1903), 375-389, or, to be accurate, 381-395. Cf. F. MEHL, *Die Mainzer Erzbischofswahl vom Jahre 1514 und der Streit um Erfurt in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen*, Bonn, 1905.

such as had been hitherto unknown in Germany. There were difficulties in Rome about his confirmation in the sees, which were increased by Cardinal Lang, who had hoped to secure Magdeburg and Halberstadt for himself. Large-hearted as he was in such matters, Leo X. must have hesitated to confide to the care of a prince only twenty-five years of age a field of jurisdiction so vast as to baffle the powers of a man of great experience, even were he to confine himself to the supervision of what was absolutely necessary.

But all hesitation vanished before the enticing prospect of securing the loyalty of the two powerful Brandenburg Electors by this act of condescension. After long negotiations the object of Albert's ambition was achieved. In August, 1514, he was confirmed in the archiepiscopal see of Mayence, together with that of Magdeburg and the episcopal see of Halberstadt. It is true that for his confirmation in these sees he had to pay a fee of 14,000 ducats, besides the extraordinary tax of 10,000 ducats for holding the two extra bishoprics. The whole sum was advanced by the celebrated banking house of Fugger, which reigned over international finance, under the management of the genial Jakob Fugger.* To indemnify him, and above all to enable him to pay his debt to Fugger, Albert was entrusted with the proclamation of the St. Peter's Indulgence in the ecclesiastical provinces of Mayence and Magdeburg, including the diocese of Halberstadt, and throughout the territory of the house of Brandenburg. Half the proceeds were to go towards defraying the expenses of St. Peter's, and the other half to the Archbishop of Mayence. It has been held that Albert made an offer for the grant of the indulgence in his territories, and that the 10,000 ducats were a premium paid in advance by him for the favour; but later researches have

* Albert's bond for 29,000 Rhenish gulden, in SCHULTE, II., 93 seq.

disproved this.* The 10,000 ducats were rather an extraordinary fee paid by him for the right to hold the sees of Magdeburg and Halberstadt in addition to that of Mayence. As a matter of fact Brandenburg made no offer for the privilege of proclaiming the indulgence, the proposal coming to him from the Dataria. The Envoy of Albert was at first but little inclined to meddle with the affair, because, said he, "dissatisfaction and perhaps worse might come from it." But at last there was nothing left to him but to consent. Probably the chief agent of this business was the future Cardinal Armellini.†

Though the term of simony has been applied to this case, it is not quite borne out by facts.‡ Still the whole

* Cf. SCHULTE, I., 121 *seqq.*, 115 *seqq.* He was the first to clear up the matter by means of the correspondence between Albert, the Elector of Brandenburg, and the Roman Ambassador, kept in the State Archives, Magdeburg.

† See KALKOFF in the *Archiv für Ref. Gesch.*, I., 385 *seq.*

‡ SCHULTE'S (I., 115, 118, 121 *seq.*, 127) repeated and severely-worded accusation of simony has been rejected by Schrörs, Paulus, and Pfülf; so also KALKOFF (*Arch. für Ref. Gesch.*, I., 379 *seq.*). On the other hand, W. SCHNÖRING (*Joh. Blankenfeld, Halle, 1905*) holds (26 *seq.*) to the opinion of Schulte, and tries to prove the charge of simony (91-94) against Kalkoff, Schrörs, and Pfülf. The difference of opinion need cause no surprise. Whoever is versed in the decisions of canon law, knows how difficult it is to decide whether simony existed in this, that, or the other particular case. ESSER (*Kirchenlexicon*, XI., 2, 326) argues as follows: "Those cases must not be judged simoniacal, where what is temporal is not given as the *remuneration* of that which is spiritual, but is offered only *on the occasion* of the exercise of a spiritual function, and under another name. Thus, much depends exteriorly on the mode, and interiorly on the intention, of giver and recipient." As the Pope has need of material means for the government of the Church, he can, without being guilty of simony, raise a tribute from the members of the Church by granting a spiritual equivalent. The demand for 10,000 ducats, for permission to hold the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, involved no *formal* or *legal*

thing, looked at from every point of view, was a disgraceful affair for all concerned.* That it, together with other causes, led to the impending catastrophe, appears to us like a judgment from heaven. Even if the proclamation of the above-mentioned indulgence were but, so to speak, the last stone which set the avalanche in motion, it is a fact, proved by what took place, that the revolt against the Papacy proceeded from a grave abuse, patent to all beholders, connected with the obnoxious financial transactions of the Roman Curia. No doubt its demands for money affected the clergy primarily; but what weighed most with the discontent of the laity, was that the enforced payment of a certain sum of money should be added to the usual conditions for gaining an indulgence.

An indulgence† is, according to the doctrine of the right to those sees, though the money did represent an *equitable* equivalent. This is conceded by SCHNÖRING (91). The Brandenburg Envoys were reminded "that His Holiness had been informed from several quarters that he must claim an equitable composition for the concession and confirmation of such benefices" (SCHULTE, II., 109). The Curia could take its stand on the ground of equity, and declare that there had been nothing simoniacal. Cf. GÖLLER in the Gött. Gelehrt. Anz., 1905, 642 *seq.* See SCHRÖRS, Leo X., Die Mainzer Erzbischofswahl und der deutsche Ablass für St. Peter im Jahre 1514, in the Zeits. f. Kat. Theol., XXXI., 267 *seq.*

* KALKOFF, *loc. cit.*, pertinently declares that "the greater part of the guilt of the scandalous proceedings connected with these arrangements, the strife caused by the indulgence, the increase in the existing discontent with existing ecclesiastical conditions, which made Luther's action so momentous, must all be laid on the brothers Hohenzollern, who approached the Curia with the request for such a monstrous accumulation of benefices."

† Of the older Catholic literature on the subject of indulgences we must consider: BELLARMINE, *De indulg. et iub. libri duo*, Romae, 1599; LUGO, *Disput. de virtute et sacramento poenitentiae, item de suffragiis et indulgentiis*, Lugd., 1638; E. AMORT, *De orig., progressu, valore ac fructu indulg.* Aug. Vind., 1735; THEOD. A SPIRITU SANCTO, *Tract.*

Catholic Church, as defined in the 13th century, a remission of the temporal punishment which remains due to sin, after its guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted in the sacrament of penance; which temporal punishment remains, to be suffered either here or in purgatory. Dispensers of indulgences are the Pope and Bishops, who draw from the inexhaustible treasury which the Church possesses in the merits of Jesus Christ, the most Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Saints (*thesaurus ecclesiae*). The indispensable condition for gaining any indulgence, is the state of grace given by means of contrition and confession. Besides this, good works, such as prayer, visits to churches, almsgiving, and pious offerings for holy objects and for the common welfare of the Church, are prescribed.

A distinction must be drawn between plenary indulgences, which cancel all temporal punishment due to sin,

dogm. mor. de indulgentiis, Romae, 1743. Of more modern literature, *cf.* GRÖNE, *Der Ablass, seine Geschichte und Bedeutung in der Heilsökonomie*, Ratisbonne, 1863; SCHANZ, *Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sakramenten der Kath. Kirche*, Freiburg, 1893, 613 *seqq.*; LEA, *Hist. of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, III., Philadelphia, 1896; *cf.* *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. religieuse*, III. (1898), 434 *seqq.*; BERINGER, *Die Ablass* 12, Paderborn, 1900; A. KURZ, *Die Kath. Lehre vom Ablass vor und nach dem Auftreten Luthers*, Paderborn, 1900; *cf.* *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LX., 88 *seq.*; LÉPICIER, *Les indulgences*, Paris, 1903, 2 vols. (see in this many criticisms on Lea). The *Spezial Studien* of PAULUS are distinguished by their learning and profundity (see *Zeitschr. für Kath. Theol.*, XXIII., 48 *seqq.*, 423 *seqq.*, 743 *seqq.*; XXIV., 1 *seqq.*, 182 *seqq.*, 249 *seqq.*, 390 *seqq.*, 644 *seq.*; XXV.; 338 *seqq.*, 740 *seqq.*; XXVII., 368 *seqq.*, 598 *seqq.*, 767 *seqq.*, and Tetzl, 84 *seqq.*) which are a profound refutation of the erroneous views advocated by HARNACK (*Dogmengesch.*, III.), DIECKHOFF (*Der Ablassstreit*, Gotha, 1886), and BRIEGER (*Das Wesen des Ablasses am Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Leipzig, 1897). For criticisms of Harnack and Dieckhoff, *cf.* FINKE, *Kirchenpolitik. Verhältnisse*, 112 *seqq.*, and MAUSBACH in *Der Katholik*, 1897, I., 48 *seqq.*, 97 *seqq.*; II., 37 *seqq.*, 109 *seqq.*

and partial indulgences, which cancel only a part of the same. Plenary indulgences, which the Pope alone, as Vicar of Christ, can grant, were granted in the second half of the 11th Century to Crusaders.* A special kind of plenary indulgence is the Jubilee Indulgence,† which was first granted by Boniface VIII. When such a Jubilee Indulgence was promulgated, it was done in an especially solemn manner. Confessors-extraordinary were appointed, with faculties more extensive than those exercised in the ordinary ministrations of a parish priest to his flock, and which gave them the power of absolution in reserved cases.

As regarded the application of indulgences to the dead, theologians were of divided opinion until the middle of the 15th century. Some rejected it or left the matter open, while others said it was lawful. The latter view gained general acceptance under the influence of the decisions of Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII.; and by the beginning of the 16th century the application of indulgences to the souls in purgatory was no longer disputed by any Catholic writer.‡ As an indulgence for the dead is fundamentally nothing else than a solemn form of prayer for the dead, according to the general opinion it could be gained even in a state of mortal sin; whereas, if anyone wished to gain an indulgence for himself, contrition and confession were necessary conditions, added to some good work prescribed, such as a visit to a church or a pious offering in money.§

The Papal Bulls all put forward the doctrine of Indul-

* In all probability Alexander II., 1063, granted a plenary indulgence to the Crusaders against the Moors in Spain, see HERZOG, *Realenzykl.* IX., 3, 79.

† Cf. Vol. II. of this work, 75.

‡ Cf. PAULUS in the *Zeitschr. für Kath. Theol.*, XXIV., 1 *seqq.*, 249 *seqq.*

§ PAULUS, *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 294.

gences with dogmatic accuracy;* and most theologians of the declining Middle Ages, though they may differ on individual points, agree in essentials; and all unite in explaining indulgences, not as being a remission of guilt, but as a remission of temporal punishment. All equally start from the presumption that, in order to gain an indulgence, the sin must have been already forgiven through contrition and confession. In the sermons and catechetical writings of the 15th century, the doctrine of indulgences is treated clearly and theologically. The sermons preached by the celebrated Geiler von Kaisersberg in 1501 and 1502 are quite a standard explanation of Christian doctrine.† The ordinary pastors of souls preached, only with varying skill, the doctrines of the Church as formulated by Popes and theologians. Sermons of the 15th century which have been preserved, prove how plainly and thoroughly this was done, and in such a way that persons of the more ignorant classes must have understood the matter.‡

Such preaching of indulgences in accordance with the spirit of the Church could have only a beneficial effect, and constituted a means of extraordinary work for souls which may be compared with that of popular missions at the present day.§ A number of elements combined on such occasions to produce a powerful influence on the

* This applies even to Boniface IX. Cf. PAULUS, Bonifatius IX., und der Ablass von Schuld und Strafe, in the *Zeitschr. für Kath. Theol.*, XXV., 386 *seqq.*; see also by the same, Tetzl, 97 *seq.*, and JANSEN, Bonifatius IX., 170 *seq.*

† Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, I., 18, 56.

‡ Cf. A. FRANZ in *Der Katholik*, 1904, II., 113, who gives most interesting quotations from the sermon of a parish priest (1468-1477), to be found in Cod. 365 of the Canons' Library, St. Florian.

§ This pertinent comparison is made by SCHRÖRS in his valuable review of Schulte in the *Wissenschaftl. Beil. zur Germania*, 1904, No. 14. Cf. PFÜLF in the *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, LXVII., 321 *seq.*

spiritual life of the people; and zealous reformers in the Church, such as Geiler von Kaisersberg, attached the utmost importance to the preaching of an indulgence.* The season of grace was ushered in with special and impressive solemnities, such as processions, prayers, canticles, the erection of crosses, or pictures of the Mother of God with her Divine Son lying dead on her knee. Well-known preachers were invited from a distance to instruct the people in frequent discourses, not only about the indulgence itself, but about all the truths of faith and the duties of the Christian life, with exhortations to repentance and amendment of life.†

For those thus stirred up to better things there were always at hand their own confessors, to whom to have recourse, these being, for the occasion, provided with special faculties for absolution in reserved cases and for dispensation from vows, being moreover well fitted to deal with all the ordinary cases of conscience submitted to them. Not only were the faithful exhorted to frequent the sacraments, but they were incited to prayer, almsgiving, fasting, devotion to the Saints, and all other holy practices. Whoever profited conscientiously by this time of grace granted by the Church, was sure to make progress in the spiritual life. After what had perhaps been a long life of sin, he was reconciled to his Lord and God, and enabled to set forth, full of good resolutions, to lead henceforward a good Christian life. Such a season of grace was also a

* Cf. *Histor. polit.*, Bl., XLIX., 394 *seq.*

† Cf. the instruction for carrying out the Constance Indulgence, 1513, in SCHULTE, II., 40 *seq.* Four points were emphasised in all instructions on indulgences of that time, as is shewn by PAULUS (Tetzel, 87): (1) Indulgences for the living; (2) "Confessionals" or indulgence-letters; (3) Frequentation of the sacraments, usually connected with the "Confessionals"; (4) Indulgences for the dead.

powerful means of alleviating the sorrows of life. The unfortunate of every kind found strength and consolation under suffering, and returned to the difficult duties of their life comforted and reinvigorated. In this way indulgences represented a true renewal of spiritual life. Many witnesses testify that, towards the close of the Middle Ages, this end proposed was often attained.*

It is true that even then complaints were made by unsuspected and credible persons of many abuses connected with indulgences. Nearly all arose from this, that the faithful, after frequenting the sacrament of penance, as the recognized condition for gaining the indulgence, found themselves called on to make an offering of money in proportion with their means. This offering for good works, which should have been only accessory, was in certain cases made into the chief condition. Thus an indulgence was lowered from its ideal purpose and degraded into a merely financial transaction. The need of money instead of the good of souls became only too often the end of the indulgence.

Like nearly all the abuses which disfigured the Church at the close of the Middle Ages, this about indulgences dates to a great extent from the Schism of the West.† In order to hold his own against the French anti-popes, Boniface IX., who was not scrupulous in his methods of supplying the apostolic coffers,‡ granted an unusual number of indulgences, with the avowed object of procuring money. This he did first by proclaiming in 1390 a Roman Jubilee over a large area, including Italy and Germany. To this in itself no exception could be taken; but the gaining of the indulgence was connected with conditions which could

* Cf. PAULUS, Tetzels, 124 *seq.*

† Nevertheless, even in the 13th century, B. von Berthold of Ratisbon complains of abuses connected with indulgences.

‡ See Vol. I. of this work, 164.

not fail to lead to abuses. To the ordinary conditions this was added, that whoever wished to gain a plenary indulgence must offer the same amount of money which he would have spent on a journey to Rome and in the churches there. All details were to be arranged with the collector: even should he ask but a small tribute from some, and a merely nominal offering from the very poor, still the fact remained that such "bargaining between collector and pilgrim gave so marked a stamp of business to the Jubilee, that there could not fail to be unauthorized imposition on the side of the collector, and fraudulent excuses on the side of the pilgrim." Of all monies received half had to be sent to Rome.* The evil consequences of all this were soon made evident. Neither religious nor secular clergy shrank from the direct sale of spiritual gifts, and gave absolution for money to those who did not even profess to have contrition. Boniface IX. was told of these abuses, but instead of ordering stringent measures to be taken, he only expressed his displeasure with many of the clergy who possessed indulgence-faculties because they would render no account of the proceeds. The impression that the question of money was the chief consideration with the Roman Curia, was increased by the intelligence that the official agents of the Jubilee Indulgence in Cologne in 1394, an abbot and a banker, were living together. This was the first instance of the kind. Another custom arose of appointing sub-delegates for the proclamation of the indulgence, which no doubt weakened the sense of responsibility in the real dispensers.† Much mischief was done by the expenses attendant on publishing the Bulls of

* JANSEN, Bonifatius IX., 143. That, even in the first half of the 15th century, the practices of Boniface IX. led to the commutation of vows, is shown by GÖLLER in the *Gött. Gelehrt.-Anz.*, 1905, 649 *seq.*

† JANSEN, Bonifatius IX., 143.

indulgences. In addition to the great cost of preparing them, large fees had to be given to the officials of the Curia. There are undoubted proofs that this went on during the pontificate of Boniface IX.*

Boniface's successors went even further than he did. All the Popes of the latter days of the Middle Ages, driven by Crusade difficulties and other embarrassments, or else moved by the constant requests for assistance from clergy and laity, granted indulgences to quite an extraordinary extent, both as to number and area. Though in the wording of the Bulls, the doctrine of the Church was never departed from, and confession, contrition, and definitely prescribed good works were made the condition for gaining the indulgence, still the financial side of the matter was always apparent, and the necessity of making offerings of money was placed most scandalously in the foreground. Indulgences took more and more the form of a monetary arrangement, which led to many conflicts with the secular powers, who were always demanding a share of the proceeds. "That he who granted the grace should receive a share gave no offence, but it was the amount which was the occasion of scandal. The faithful felt themselves wronged by the Curia; and so also did the members of the latter feel themselves aggrieved by the Emperor and territorial Princes, who either forbade the proclamation of the indulgence in their lands, or else seized the profits."†

With the multiplication and extension of indulgences, and their conversion into money transactions, it was obvious, considering the covetousness of the age, that the gravest abuses should prevail at their promulgation. Pain-

* Cf. HÖHLBAUM'S extracts from the State Archives, Cologne, XII. (188), 67 *seq.*; public letters of the Cologne Envoy, 1394.

† SCHULTE, I., 179; WEIDLUNG, *Schwedische Reformationsgesch.*, 22, 40.

ful occurrences were frequent at the collection and division of the indulgence offerings. No wonder that loud and violent complaints were heard on every side. We can understand what the abuses must have been if even a good man like Eck, who was devoted to the Holy See, could complain openly that "one indulgence drove out another!" Eck reported that "permissory letters" were given as the actual reward of crime.* Jerome Emser severely censures the guilt of "the covetous commissaries, monks, and priests, who preach the indulgence in a shameless manner, and lay more stress on money than on confession, contrition, and penance."† Murner also speaks of the abuses connected with indulgences.‡ These, however, were by no means confined to Germany. At the Council of Trent, Cardinal Pacheco complained of the doings of the preachers who proclaimed the "cruciata" indulgence in Spain.§ The

* Cf. Eck's reformation proposals in the Beitr. z. bayr. Kirchengesch., II., 222.

† EMSER, Wider das unchristliche Buch Luthers an den tewtschen Adel, 1521, cf. G. 4.

‡ JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 137.

§ Concil. Trid., I., Friburgi, 1901, 51. About the scandalous behaviour of the "quaestionarii" in Germany, cf. the examples brought forward by FALK in Der Katholik, 1891, I., 574. The * "Tractatus contra questores," in which the Dominican P. Schwarz draws the attention of William of Reichenau, Bishop of Eichstätt (1464-1496), to the conduct of the *questores*, as being contrary to ecclesiastical tradition and precept, is very interesting. I owe to Dr Grabmann a closer acquaintance with this document in Cod. 688 *seg.*, 139b-144b of the Library at Eichstätt. Schwarz passes a scathing criticism on the draft of an indulgence, which he brands as a falsification of the valid form. In such the words *vere contritus et confessus* are always to be found; but in this one the clause is omitted. By such falsifications, he says, the people lose all confidence in a valid indulgence, and cease to contribute to the good works prescribed by the Church. In fol. 143b Schwarz makes the following summary of the abuses connected with the action of the

severe Cardinal Ximenes, notwithstanding his devotion to the Holy See, expressed his disapprobation of the indulgence proclaimed by Leo X. for building St. Peter's.* In the Netherlands such scandal was given among the more strict Catholics by the behaviour of the indulgence commissaries, and by the frivolity with which they granted dispensations, that at Louvain open protestations were made in 1516 against the proclamation.† At the Lateran Council some of the Bishops complained of the abuses attending the proclamation of the indulgence by the Minorites. A compromise was agreed to;‡ but this effected no good, for Egidio Canisio remonstrated with Adrian VI. for entrusting the indulgence to the Franciscans, which militated against the jurisdiction of the Bishops. No

questores: (1) the *questores* hinder the dispensing of the Word of God, by wasting the time set aside for the sermon by their traffic in letters of indulgence, one-third of the proceeds of which they retain; (2) the faith of the people suffers from the neglect of the Word of God (ad incredulitatem disponitur); (3) the supreme authority of the Church, to which such indulgences are attributed, is vilified; (4) misuse of and wrong-doings connected with relics; (5) the *questores*, who boast of the power of the keys committed to them, are ignorant, and carry on a scandalous traffic; (6) the people are sucked dry. One single *questor* carried off from the diocese of Eichstätt in one year the sum of 1000 guilders, of which scarcely ten reached the hospital for which they had been offered. In conclusion (f. 144b), Schwarz refers the Bishop to the example of the Archbishop of Salzburg, who drove the *questores* out of his diocese, and threatened with censure all priests who had any dealings with them.

* HEFELE, Ximenes, 458 (2nd ed., 433); cf. LEA, III., 386. About the opposition to the Indulgence of 1516, see LUDEWIG, Politik Nürnbergs, in Der Reformationszeit, Göttingen, 1881, 4 seq.

† Attention is called by FREDERICQ (La question des indulgences dans les Pays Bas au commencement du XVI^e siècle, Bruxelles, 1899) to this newly-discovered document referred to by PAULUS, Histor. Jahrb., XXI., 139.

‡ Cf. HEFELE-HIRGENRÖTHER, VIII., 637-638.

proofs are needed of how much the authority of the Church suffered from all this, what scandal was given, or what occasion offered to her enemies to blaspheme. Cardinal Canisio was of opinion that the facilities for absolution encouraged sinners, and were an inducement to sin.*

In Italy also, voices were raised in protest against the undue multiplicity of indulgences.† Satirists like Ariosto jeered at their cheapness,‡ while seriously-minded men like Sadolet emphatically opposed them. But Leo, always in need of money, paid no attention. He was surrounded by unscrupulous advisers, such as Cardinal Pucci, who knew how to appease his conscience by—to put it mildly—their rare gifts of casuistry.§ It is therefore not surprising that the Medici Pope committed himself to the proclamation of this indulgence, which he entrusted to the new Elector, Albert of Brandenburg.

The petition of Albert of Brandenburg to be entrusted

* Promemoria to Adrian VI., from HÖFLER, in the *Denkschr. d. Münch. Akad.*, IV., part 3, 73 *seq.*

† SANUTO, XXIV., 105, 448.

‡ Along with the third satire (v. 228), and the passages cited from the “*Scolastica*” by GASPARY, II., 422, *cf.* especially the prologue to the “*Negromante*,” the performance of which was forbidden by the Pope on this account, though he himself was praised in it. A still stronger attack on indulgences is to be found in “*Rinaldo ardito*,” IV., 38, of which the authorship, attributed to Ariosto, is not established.

§ *Cf.* JOVIUS, *Vita*, l. 4. It is remarkable to see how this friend of the Medici tries to defend him in the matter of the Indulgence, and when he writes lays all the blame on the sub-commissaries when he says: “*In his vero quae rem divinam respicerent nequaquam secunda fama praegravari est visus. Nam indulgentias vetera pontificum ad parandam pecuniam instrumenta adeo plene atque affluenter provinciis dedit, ut fidem sacrosanctae potestatis elevare videretur: in hoc etiam detestabili legatorum avaritia deceptus, qui se animas defunctorum singulis acceptis aureis expiare a purgatoriisque poenis eripere profitebantur.*”

with the proclamation of the Mayence and Magdeburg Indulgence * was dated the 1st of August, 1514, and received the *placet* of the Pope on the very same day.† But the proclamation itself was delayed for a short time.‡ The Bull was not prepared until the 31st of March, 1515.§ By it the Archbishop of Mayence and the Franciscan Guardian of that city were nominated the indulgence commissaries in the provinces named in Albert's petition, for eight years from the publication of the Bull. The commissaries were given the right to suspend all other indulgences in their official circuit. They were also entrusted with the *Motu Proprio* of Leo X. of the 15th of April|| to the Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, as Camerlengo, and his official subordinates, which confirmed the Jubilee Indulgence applied for by Albert in his petition. The Bull passed immediately into the hands of the Emperor Maximilian, who made use of the favourable opportunity to secure some of the proceeds for himself. To enable the Emperor to reap the benefit of three out of the eight years' indulgence granted by the Pope, the Chancellor of Mayence, Johann von Dalheim, arranged to pay in each of these three years 1000 Rhenish florins into the imperial exchequer, which money was to be applied to the erection of the

* Printed by KÖRNER, *Tetzel der Ablassprediger*, 142 *seq.*, and SCHULTE, II., 107-109. Cf. SCHULTE, I., 124.

† Cf. SCHULTE, II., 143.

‡ Cf. PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 31 *seq.*; SCHULTE, I., 125 *seqq.*

§ This Bull, unknown to earlier investigators, was first made use of about the Tetzel affair by PAULUS (*Tetzel*, 31), and later published from the original in the Library of the Munich University by KÖHLER, *Dokumente zum Ablassstreite*, 83-93, and entered later in the Register by SCHULTE, II., 135-143. Cf. GÖLLER in the *Gött. Gelehrt.-Anz.*, 1905, 657 *seq.*

|| Printed in KÖRNER, *loc. cit.*, 143 *seq.*, and in SCHULTE, II., 143 *seq.* Cf. KÖRNER, 48-50; SCHULTE, I., 125 *seq.*

Church of St. James, adjoining the imperial residence at Innsbruck.*

As it was not explicitly stated in the Bull that half of the proceeds were to go to the Archbishop of Mayence, the latter, to avoid future molestation, decided to delay the promulgation of the indulgence until he had received an unambiguous assurance from Rome† to that effect. The arrangements connected with this caused fresh delay. As the Papal Brief, giving the assurance asked for, and sent off on the 14th of February, arrived at Mayence only a few days before the Jubilee Sunday, it was, as the provost Dietrich Zobel wrote to Albert, too late for that year.‡ Thus it was that the preaching of the indulgence was introduced in Mayence only at the beginning of the fateful year 1517. In consequence of the confusion which ensued, it was carried on during only two years out of the eight. According to Fugger's estimate, only lately discovered, the proceeds were distinctly less than they had been on any previous occasion.§ It appears that after paying the duty to the Emperor, Albert received as his share scarcely half of the "composition," to say nothing of the confirmation fees. "The Mayence and Magdeburg Indulgence was a bad speculation for Albert, from a purely mercantile point of view." It is a manifest fable that Tetzel received for the Elector of Mayence in one year the sum of 100,000 golden florins.

After January, 1517, Tetzel is known to us as the

* SCHULTE, II., 147 *seq.*; *ibid.*, I., 130.

† Cf. PAULUS, Tetzel, 31 *seq.*; SCHULTE, I., 130 *seqq.*; II., 148 *seqq.*

‡ KÖRNER, 147; SCHULTE, II., 152.

§ SCHULTE, I., 144-150; Die Urkunden, II., 190-192, 193 *seq.*, 197.

|| About Tetzel, see the excellent monograph by PAULUS (Mayence, 1899), and the same author's completion of it in *Der Katholik*, 1899, I., 484 *seq.*, and 1901, I., 453 *seq.*, 554 *seq.* See furthermore in the

Archbishop of Mayence's general sub-commissary.* On the 24th of January he was at Eisleben, which then belonged to the diocese of Halberstadt, throughout which, as well as the archdiocese of Magdeburg, he subsequently travelled.† Early in the year he arrived at Jutterbog, whither there came many people from the neighbouring town of Wittenberg to gain the indulgence, because it was not allowed to be proclaimed in Saxony.‡ On this

same the short sketch, *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 1-9. By the labours of Paulus the earlier works of GRÖNE (*Tetzel und Luther*, 2, Soest, 1860) and KÖRNER (*Tetzel, Frankenberg*, 1880) have been superseded. Cf. besides GRUBE, *Die Tetzel-Literatur der Neuzeit*, in the *Literar Rundschau*, 1889, No. 6; FALK in *Der Katholik*, 1891, I., 496 *seq.*; O. MICHAEL, *Tetzel in Annaberg*, in the *Allg. Zeitg.*, 1901, Beil. Nos. 87 and 88. The latest work of DIBELIUS in *Beitr. zur sächs. Kirchengesch.*, XVII. (1904), 1 *seqq.*, is insufficient; see *Histor. Zeitschr.*, 93, 509. About the indulgence contest generally, cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18. Also: *An meine Kritiker*, Letter 14, 66-81; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 1-173; RIFFEL, *Christliche Kirchengesch. der neuesten Zeit*, I, 2, Mayence, 1844. On the Protestant side: A. W. DIECKHOFF, *Der Ablassstreit, dogmengeschichtlich dargestellt*, Gotha, 1886. The biographies of Luther by KÖSTLIN and KOLDE. Original authorities: J. E. KAPP, *Schauplatz des Tetzelischen Ablass-Krams und des darwider streitenden Sel. D. Martini Lutheri*, 2, Leipzig, 1720, and, *Sammlung einiger zum Päbstlichen Ablass überhaupt, sonderlich aber zu der im Anfang der Reformation zwischen D. Martin Luther und Johann Tetzel hiervon geführten Streitigkeit gehörigen Schrifften*, Leipzig, 1721; W. KÖHLER, *Dokumente zum Ablassstreit von 1517*, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1902. Also by the same: *Luthers 95 Thesen samt seinen Resolutionen sowie den Gegenschriften von Wimpina—Tetzel, Eck und Prierias, und den Antworten Luthers darauf*, Leipzig, 1903. Cf. MANDONNET, *J. Tetzel*, Paris, 1901.

* Cf. HERRMANN in the *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XXIII, 263 *seq.*

† Cf. PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 34 *seqq.*; *Der Katholik*, 1901, I., 465 *seqq.*; *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 3.

‡ The account given by Johann Oldecop of Hildesheim that Tetzel had proclaimed the indulgence even in Wittenberg, is no doubt an error on the part of that chronicler; cf. PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 38 *seqq.*, as

occasion the professor of Wittenberg, Martin Luther, who was already secretly estranged from the Church, busied himself with the matter of the indulgence.

No doubt Tetzal was an eloquent and popular preacher, but owing to what followed his words on this occasion, his powers have been overrated by friend and foe alike.* In the interests of historical truth we must no more agree with all that Tetzal said and did, than we must accept the conventional picture drawn by his adversaries. The accusations of gross immorality brought against him by contemporary opponents are mere inventions, as also is the assertion of modern writers that he preached scandalously and criminally about the Mother of God. These charges can be proved to be calumnies by Tetzal's own evidence, supported by official witnesses.† The purport of Tetzal's indulgence sermons has been distorted in the most absurd manner. The mistakes made have come chiefly from the fact that sufficient care has not been taken to keep distinct the questions of different kinds which arose.‡ Above all,

well as his treatise, *Tetzal und Oldecop*, in *Der Katholik*, 1899, I., 484 *seqq.* In the passage in Aurifaber's edition of Luther's *Tischreden* (Eisleben, 1566, Bl. 625b), where such an assertion is put into Luther's mouth, Aurifaber in the original record of Veit Dietrich, in which there is an evident allusion to the indulgence for the Schloss-kirche at Wittenberg, of March 1516, quite arbitrarily introduced both the name of Tetzal and the date 1517. PAULUS in *Der Katholik*, 1901, I., 467 *seq.*

* Paulus gives an objective and altogether just estimate of his words which have been quoted.

† Cf. PAULUS, *Tetzal*, 56-69; *Der Katholik*, 1901, I., 556-560; *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 5 *seq.*

‡ As regards the doctrine of indulgences as preached by Tetzal, cf. especially PAULUS, *Tetzal*, 84-169; *Der Katholik*, 1901, I., 561-570; *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 6 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 82-85. A noteworthy source of information as regards Tetzal's teaching is the "Vorlegung, gemacht von Bruder Johann Tetzal, Prediger Ordens Ketzermeister: wyder eynem vormessen Sermon von tzwanzig irrigen

a most clear distinction must be made between indulgences for the living and those for the dead. As regards indulgences for the living, Tetzel always taught pure doctrine. The assertion that he put forward indulgences as being not only a remission of the temporal punishment of sin, but as a remission of its guilt, is as unfounded as is that other accusation against him, that he sold the forgiveness of sin for money, without even any mention of contrition and confession, or that, for payment, he absolved from sins which might be committed in the future. His teaching was, in fact, very definite, and quite in harmony with the theology of the Church, as it was then and as it is now, *i.e.*, that indulgences "apply only to the temporal punishment due to sins which have been already repented of and confessed." *

The so-called indulgence and confession letters (*confessionalia*) could, it is true, be obtained for payment alone, without contrition or any other condition. The mere gaining of such a letter granted neither the forgiveness of sin nor the gaining of any indulgence. All that its possessor acquired was the right, once in his life and at the hour of death, to receive at the hands of a confessor freely chosen by himself, and after a good confession, absolution from most of the cases reserved to the Pope.

Artiklen Bebstlichen ablas und gnade belangende allen christglaubigen menschen tzuwissen von notten," in LÖSCHER, Reformatiionsakta, I., 484-503; KAPP, Sammlung, 317-356; GRÖNE, Tetzel, 2, 219-234; the defence of Tetzel's theses before the schools of Frankfort, collected by Wimpina, in LÖSCHER, I., 507-517; PAULUS, Tetzel, 171-180 (*cf.* KÖHLER, Luthers 95 Thesen); also especially the instructions given to Tetzel for his mission; the Mayence instructions (*Instructio summaria pro subcommissariis penitentiariis et confessoribus in executionem gratiae plenissimarum indulgentiarum . . .*), printed by KAPP, Sammlung, 117-206 (translation of the same, 207-286).

* *Cf.* Tetzel's "Vorlegung," Art. 7; PAULUS, Tetzel, 88 *seq.*

A plenary indulgence was attached to this.* Thus, in this case also, contrition and confession were the recognized conditions for gaining the indulgence.†

The case was very different with indulgences for the dead. As regards these there is no doubt that Tetzels did, according to what he considered his authoritative instructions, proclaim as Christian doctrine that nothing but an offering of money was required to gain the indulgence‡ for the dead, without there being any question of contrition or confession. He also taught, in accordance with the opinion then held, that an indulgence could be applied to any given soul with unfailing effect. Starting from this assumption, there is no doubt that his doctrine was virtually that of the drastic proverb: "As soon as money in the coffer rings, the soul from purgatory's fire springs."§ The Papal Bull of indulgence gave no sanction whatever to this proposition. It was a vague scholastic opinion, rejected by the Sorbonne in 1482, and again in 1518, and certainly not a doctrine of the Church, which was thus improperly put forward as dogmatic truth. The first among the theologians of the Roman court, Cardinal Cajetan, was the enemy of all such extravagances, and declared emphatically that, even if theologians and preachers taught such opinions, no faith need be given them. "Preachers," said he, "speak in the name of the Church only so long as they proclaim the

* In order to guard against abuses, it was decreed by the Church that the letter should cease to be valid should the holder of it, trusting to it, commit sin. See PAULUS, *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXV., 636.

† Cf. PAULUS, Tetzels, 130 *seqq.*; Die deutschen Dominikaner, 6, Der Katholik, 1899, II., 456-458; SCHMIDLIN, Sanson, 38 *seqq.*, where (pp. 44 *seqq.*) an "indulgence letter" for the town of Solothurn, signed by Sanson, is given in the original with translation, and reproduced in facsimile.

‡ Cf. PAULUS, Tetzels, 138 *seqq.*

§ *Ibid.*, 149.

doctrine of Christ and His Church ; but if, for purposes of their own, they teach that about which they know nothing, and which is only their own imagination, they must not be accepted as mouth-pieces of the Church. No one must be surprised if such as these fall into error." *

Unfortunately many of the preachers of the indulgence in Germany and elsewhere were not as prudent as Cardinal Cajetan. Without hesitation they proclaimed scholastic opinions as if they were defined truth, and always obtruded the question of money in a manner which did much harm. Tetzel cannot be exonerated from blame in this respect, even if he did not go as far as Arcimboldi.† Tetzel was no doubt prone to exaggerations, and was wanting in modesty and simplicity. His manner was arrogant and pretentious, and he carried out the duties of his office in such a business-like way that scandals could not fail to arise. Even men who were in other respects quite on his side, complain of this. His contemporary and brother in religion, Johann Lindner, reproaches him severely for making gain his first object. "Tetzel," he writes, "devised unheard-of means of making money. He was far too liberal in conferring offices ; he put up far too many public crosses in towns and villages, which caused scandal and bred complaints among the people." Thus spiritual treasures were carped at, on account of the abuses which accompanied them.‡

* PAULUS, Tetzel, 165. Tizio, the canon of Siena, also censures the "importuni viri et praesumptuosi concionatores atque indulgentiarum pontificalium datores et questores elemosinarum, sub indulgentiarum consecutionibus," who challenged Luther ; see PICCOLOMINI, Tizio, 128.

† KALKOFF in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXXIII., 369, says that it must be admitted that in this respect the "Romanists," *i.e.* the Italian courtiers, whom Luther attacked actually more than he did Tetzel, caused the cup of German patience to flow over.

‡ PAULUS, Tetzel, 120, 134 ; *cf.* 166.

A professor of Wittenberg University, whose name had, hitherto, been known but to few, became the interpreter of the widespread indignation caused by the abuses connected with the proclamation of the indulgence. On the 31st of October, on the occasion of Tetzel's preaching, Martin Luther affixed to the door of the castle church of Wittenberg ninety-five theses, challenging a dispute on the subject of indulgences.* According to the academic customs of the day, there was nothing unusual in this proceeding: but a burning question was involved. Added to this was the blunt polemical style of Luther's theses, which were full of contradictions far beyond their ostensible object. They roused great attention in every quarter. Even though Tetzel's sermons were the occasion of Luther's attack, it was directed less against him personally than against the whole system of indulgences. The primary object of the Wittenberg professor's attack was the teaching body of the Church, especially the Pope and the Archbishop of Mayence, whom Luther regarded as chiefly responsible for the abuses.† In his secret heart it was not the abuses of the actual system of indulgences which were at the bottom of Luther's action. The theses of October the 31st

* Printed in the various editions of Luther's works, Weimar edition, I., 233 *seqq.* The critical edition with the notes of W. Köhler; *Luthers 95 Thesen samt seinen Resolutionen sowie den Gegenschriften von Wimpina-Tetzel, Eck, und Prierias und den Antworten Luthers derauf*, Leipzig, 1903. For a detailed statement of contents and criticism from a Catholic point of view, see HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 15-22. About the affixing of the theses, *cf.* FALK in *Der Katholik*, 1891, I., 481 *seqq.* An estimate of the theses from a Protestant point of view is given by DIECKHOFF, 40-71.

† *Cf.* PAULUS, Tetzel, 167 *seq.* In this sense Luther wrote to Tetzel to console him when he lay dangerously ill "Let him not grieve," said he, "for the thing was not begun by him; but the child has quite another father." PAULUS, 81, 169.

were nothing but the first incidental expression of his deep-lying antagonism to the Catholic doctrine of good works. The doctrines of justification by faith alone, and the absence of free-will in man, already completely formulated in his heart, could have nothing in common with such a thing.*

Luther had no intention at that time of separating himself from the Church. Neither can it be said that he took up the dispute about indulgences as a pretext to introduce his new doctrines. On the contrary, it may be assumed that he had no object beyond attacking the real and supposed abuses attached to the preaching of the indulgence. Nevertheless, the theses of the Wittenberg professor, taken as a whole, had a significance far wider than this. They could not fail to stir up the people against the authority of the Church, nor to bring indulgences into contempt, and lead the masses into error. What they put forward was a mixture of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, under which contempt and hatred of the Holy See, and much else that was reprehensible from a Catholic point of view, was scarcely concealed. The thirty-sixth thesis was directed against indulgences as interpreted by the Catholic Church, and the fifty-eighth directly denied the doctrine of the treasury of the Church.†

On the same day that he had affixed them to the church, Luther sent his theses to Archbishop Albert of Brandenburg, with a letter,‡ in which he partly summarized them, and complained of the false representations made to the people

* For the starting-point of Luther's new doctrine, *cf.* especially DENIFLE, Luther, I., and the article by GRISAR in the Lit. Beil. der Köln. Volksztg., 1903, Nos. 44-46; 1904, Nos. 1 and 3.

† With PALLAVICINO, I., c. 4, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 14-22, 24. *Cf.* especially RIFFEL, I., 32 *seqq.*

‡ This has been often printed, *e.g.* in WETTE, I., 67-70; ENDERS, I., 114 *seqq.*; KAPP, Sammlung, 292-296 (with translation, 297-302;

and the false promises of the preachers. In the beginning of the letter he says that he by no means wishes to accuse the preachers—whom he had not heard—of uttering such pernicious doctrine from the pulpit; but later, turning on them, he reproaches these same preachers because they, "by lying fables and empty promises, breed a false sense of security in the people." In conclusion, he demands of the Archbishop to countermand the instructions, which were at anyrate given without his knowledge or consent, and to replace them by a teaching of a better kind. He adds the threat that in case Albert should refuse, there might arise one who would write against the system, to the great injury of the Archbishop.

Albert of Brandenburg laid the case before his counsellors at Aschaffenburg and the professors of the University of Mayence. The first were unanimous in their desire that a process against Luther should be instituted.* The Archbishop sent on this opinion, together with Luther's theses, to the Pope, "with the good hope," as he wrote to his counsellors at Halle, "that His Holiness would grasp the situation so as to meet the error at once, as occasion offers and as the exigency requires, and not lay the responsibility on us."†

the last also in MAY, Kurfürst Albrecht, II., I. ; Beilagen und Urkunden, 47-49). FALK gives an accurate translation in *Der Katholik*, 1891, I., 483-485. He remarks on p. 486: "Whereas, at the beginning, the tone of the letter is devout and almost servile, towards the end he assumes a menacing attitude. This twofold character goes through the letter. If he exhorted and threatened alternately, he could eventually attack the indulgence, to the confusion of the Cardinal. Thus Luther manifestly regards himself as the chief and best-equipped adversary of the indulgence." Cf. PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 45-47, 126.

* Cf. PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 47.

† After the original in the State Archives, Magdeburg, in KÖRNER, *Tetzel*, 148 *seq.*; in modern German in MAY, I., *Beilagen und Urkunden*, 50-52.

He urged these counsellors to consider the document with "due deliberation and diligence." If they were of opinion that it would be advisable to make the process more stringent, they were to intimate the same to Luther through Tetzel, "in order that such poisonous error may no longer be spread among the people." But it may be safely assumed that the counsellors of Halle did not think that the legal proceedings recommended at Aschaffenburg were expedient, or that any intimation as to their increased severity was communicated to Luther through Tetzel.*

The opinion of the University of Mayence, which was sent in only on the 17th of December, 1517, after repeated reminders on the part of the Archbishop, touched on only one point in Luther's theses, namely, the limitation of the Pope's authority in the matter of indulgences. It censured this as being opposed to the traditional doctrine, to adhere to which "was safer and more advisable." The Mayence professors refused to pass a formal judgment on the propositions, but rather recommended an appeal to the decision of the Pope.†

By the propagation of Luther's theses, Tetzel felt himself called on to bring his learning to bear on the adversary. He did this by a long list of theses, which he defended before the University of Frankfort on the Oder, on the 20th of January, 1518.‡ The author of these propositions was

* Cf. PAULUS, Tetzel, 47, as against Brieger, "Über den Prozess des Erzbischofs Albrecht gegen Luther," in the *Kl. Beitr. zur Gesch.*, Leipzig, 1894, 191 *seqq.*

† See HERRMANN in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XXIII., 265-268.

‡ From the one-sheet impression in the State Library, Munich, compared with Wimpina's published text (in his *Anacephalæosis*, 1528), and the text in the Wittenberg edition of *Opera Lutheri*, I. (1545), on which all later editions are based, given in PAULUS, Tetzel, 170-180. A detailed statement of contents in HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX.,

not Tetzel himself, but the Frankfort professor, Conrad Wimpina.* His anti-theses went too far on certain points, where they put forward scholastic opinions as if they were truths of faith. Generally, however, the defence gave a solid exposition of the accepted doctrine of indulgences, and proved the errors of Luther. Special stress was laid on this, that "indulgences do not remit sin, but only the temporal punishment due to it, and this only on the condition that the sin is heartily repented of and confessed; that they do not take from the merits of Christ, but place His satisfactory sufferings in the place of the satisfactory punishment."

A travelling dealer came to Wittenberg in the middle of March with a number of copies of the Frankfort anti-theses to sell. He was at once set upon by the students who had attached themselves to Luther, and the books torn from him and burnt in the public market-place. Later, this action was blamed by Luther himself.† But shortly after, as soon indeed as he had heard of the publishing of Tetzel's theses, Luther brought out his "Sermon on Indulgences and

25-32. Cf. also GRÖNE, Tetzel, 2, 81-96; JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 85 *seq.* In the earlier literature only 106 theses are spoken of, but these form only the first portion of the whole number; cf. PAULUS, 49. The usual supposition that Tetzel was made doctor of theology on the occasion of his defence of these first theses is incorrect. He received the doctorate later, in the course of 1518, from the Frankfort University, not from the General of his own Order; cf. PAULUS in *Der Katholik*, 1901, I., 555 *seq.*; *ibid.*, Tetzel, 55.

* Cf. PAULUS, Tetzel, 49 *seqq.* If Tetzel undertook the defence of the theses written by a professor of the schools, and published them under his own name, he was but following a custom prevalent then and later at the University. It is therefore an error on the part of modern Protestant writers to conclude from this that Tetzel was an ignorant man and incapable of putting forward theses of his own.

† Cf. PAULUS, Tetzel, 52; by the same, *Die deutschen Dominikaner*, 4.

Grace,"* in which he went further than he had ever gone before.† In it he severely condemns the scholastic division of penance into confession, contrition, and satisfaction, as not being founded on Scripture. At the end of the sermon he makes this declaration: "If I am called a heretic by those whose purses will suffer from my truths, I care not much for their bawling: for only those say this whose dark understanding has never known the Bible."

In answer to this sermon, which was circulated in all parts, Tetzel published his "Vorlegung," directed "against an audacious sermon containing twenty articles full of errors concerning Papal Indulgences and Graces."‡ In this work he went exhaustively into the doctrine of indulgences.§ It is to the credit of Tetzel's acumen and theological training that he so fully grasped the scope of Luther's new doctrine, and perceived how closely it attacked the first principles of the Christian faith and the authority of the Church. Other good Christian scholars judged Luther's doctrines far too superficially, and saw nothing in the whole dispute beyond a scholastic quarrel about non-essential points. Luther's articles, Tetzel complained in his work, will cause "great scandal." For by them "many will be led to despise the supremacy and authority of the Pope and the Holy Roman See. Works of sacramental satisfaction will be left undone. Preachers and teachers will no longer be believed. Each person will interpret Holy Scripture just as he pleases. Wherefore, the practice of a holy and

* In the Weimar edition, I., 243 *seqq.* This work went through twenty-two editions between 1518 and 1520; FALK in *Der Katholik*, 1891, I., 486.

† Cf. KOLDE, Martin Luther, I., 150.

‡ Cf. *supra*, p. 347, n.

§ Cf. PAULUS, Tetzel, 53 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 87. Detailed index in HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 33-41.

simple Christianity by the greater number of the faithful must be endangered; for each one will learn to believe just what he chooses."*

At the conclusion of the "Vorlegung," which appeared in April, Tetzel announced that he would shortly publish further points of doctrine, about which he intended to hold a disputation in the Frankfort schools.† This was issued at the end of April or the beginning of May, 1518, in the form of fifty theses, composed by Tetzel himself.‡ In these he touched only incidentally on the doctrine of indulgences, having already treated it sufficiently. This time he entered more deeply into the subject of the authority of the Church, which Luther had questioned. As the professor of Wittenberg had appealed to the Bible in his attack on indulgences, Tetzel argued that there were many Catholic truths which had to be firmly believed by faithful Christians, besides those mentioned explicitly in Holy Scripture. Among these must be counted belief in the dogmatic decisions of the Pope in matters of faith, as well as that of tradition approved by the Church. He here struck the key-note of the whole dispute. Indulgences, as something incidental to the main point at issue, soon disappeared from these polemical discussions; but, on the other hand, the question of the authority of the Church always remained in the foreground.§

Luther's counter-attack on the "Vorlegung" was in

* Vorlegung Art., 19; KAPP, Sammlung, 353; GRÖNE, 233; PAULUS, Tetzel, 53.

† Vorlegung Art., 20; KAPP, 355; GRÖNE, 233.

‡ First printed in the Wittenberg edition of Opera Lutheri, I. (1545), 96-98; also in LÖSCHER, Ref.-Acta, I., 517-522. A German translation in GRÖNE, 111-115; and one later in HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 47-51.

§ PAULUS, Tetzel, 55.

pamphlet form, and bore the title, "Eyn Freyheydt des Sermons Bebstlichen Ablass und gnad belangend wider die vorlegung, so tzur schmach seyn und desselben Sermon ertichtet" (Wittenberg, 1518).^{*} In this work he only mentions Tetzel's fifty theses incidentally at the end, where he dismisses them with an ironical remark. After publishing his fifty theses, Tetzel wrote no more. In consequence of Luther's attitude, it was impossible to carry on the preaching of the indulgence. He therefore returned at the end of 1518 to the Dominican convent at Leipzig.[†]

^{*} In the Weimar edition, I., 383 *seqq.*; also in KAPP, Sammlung, 364-385. Cf. GRÖNE, 116-122; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 56.

[†] There was, as it were, an echo in Switzerland of Luther's fight against indulgences, only far less important. Bernardine Sanson of Brescia, Guardian of the Observantines in Milan, had, since the summer of 1518, been preaching the St. Peter's Indulgence in the thirteen cantons of Switzerland. He was sub-commissary to the General of the Order, Cardinal Cristoforo Numai, being delegated to the office by Papal Brief dated November, 1517. Cf. L. R. SCHMIDLIN, Bernhardin Sanson der Ablassprediger in der Schweiz, 1518-1519, Solothurn, 1898; N. PAULUS, Der Ablassprediger Bernhardin Sanson, in Der Katholik, 1899, II., 434-458. Many of the anecdotes related about Sanson's preaching by V. Anshelm and H. Bullinger are either exaggerated or fictitious; therefore the assumption is warranted that Sanson also was guilty of exaggerations as regarded the indulgence for the dead. Leo X. recalled Sanson on April 30, 1519, and promised to punish him, if he had really allowed himself to encroach on the truth (Letter in SCHMIDLIN, 30 *seq.*; cf. PAULUS, 453). The Franciscan, Gio. Batt. de Puppio, one of the indulgence commissaries (not the General of the Order, as Schmidlin calls him), wrote to the Confederate Government in the name of the Pope (cf. SCHMIDLIN, 32 *seq.*, 33 in the original text; PAULUS, 454) to ask in confidence whether they desired that Sanson should be recalled, or whether they would put up with him till the termination of his commission. If he had fallen into errors—whereat the Pope was much astonished—he must render an account of them to the Pope, and submit to punishment. Puppio wrote to Sanson himself on the 1st of May

Meanwhile, Luther's theses, translated into German and scattered broadcast about the country, were producing a great effect. As truth and falsehood were mixed in them to an extraordinary degree, both the friends and foes of ecclesiastical authority found something in them to suit them. As for the masses of the people, the cause of their approbation was to be found in the declaration that the support of the poor by almsgiving was more meritorious than the gaining of indulgences.* But the popularity of the movement came chiefly from its onslaught on the hated requisitions for money and the general abuses connected with them. Very soon all those who were discontented with the Curia—for mercantile, political, national, and other reasons—flocked after Luther,† and thus he took his place at the head of a national religious revolt, which was to be carried on by him until a large portion of the German people separated themselves from the centre of the unity of the Church.

Very few foresaw this at first: on the contrary, numbers believed both then and long after that the Wittenberg to answer the accusations of the Swiss, and command him in the name of the Pope to conform himself to their will. This put an end to Sansón's work in Switzerland: by the desire of the Swiss he returned to Italy, and disappears from history. Whether he was subjected to an official examination in Rome, or whether he was found guilty and punished, remains unknown. "Leo X. vindicated his supreme authority in this indulgence question, but he sacrificed the preacher from benevolence and consideration towards the Confederate Government, or probably in order to prevent the smouldering embers of discontent from breaking out into flame" (SCHMIDLIN, 31). Being thus rendered innocuous, the Swiss traffic in indulgences had no further consequences. "It was an entirely subordinate episode, and cannot be considered as having given birth to the movement of the new religion in Switzerland" (PAULUS, 455).

* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 23 *seq.*

† SCHULTE, I., 187.

professor was the champion of the reform of abuses in the Church, which had been looked for so eagerly by the faithful. Most people felt, no doubt, that Luther would carry on the desired reformation inside the Church and in obedience to her laws. They quite overlooked the fact that the sweeping away of abuses was only part of the reformer's programme. They either did not know, or would not admit, that he was already in vital antagonism to the Church by reason of the grave heretical doctrines which he held.

Among the few German theologians who from the very beginning feared great dangers for the Church from Luther's movement, was Johann Eck, a professor of Ingoldstadt. In his rejoinders (*obelisci*) to Luther's theses, at first disseminated only in manuscript form, he pointed out the kinship in many of the opinions expressed in them to the doctrines of Wyclif and Hus, which had been already condemned by the Church.

CHAPTER VIII.

LUTHER IS SUMMONED TO ROME.—HIS TRANSACTIONS WITH CARDINAL CAJETAN AND WITH MILTITZ.—HIS ROMAN TRIAL.—THE BULL "EXSURGE" AND ITS RECEPTION IN GERMANY.—ALEANDER'S MISSION TO THE DIET OF WORMS, AND THE IMPERIAL EDICT AGAINST LUTHER.

I.

WHEN, in the beginning of 1518, Leo X., through a notice sent to him by the Archbishop of Mayence, became cognizant of the extent of Luther's new doctrines, he at once took measures to check them.* On the 3rd of February he directed Gabriele della Volta, Vicar-General of the Augustinians, to remonstrate with Luther, either by letter, or through learned and upright envoys, and urge him

* Cf. K. MÜLLER'S profound work in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XXIV., 46-85; the detailed *Studien* of KALKOFF, *ibid.*, XXV., 90-147, 273-290, 399-459, 503-603; SCHULTE'S important contributions to *Quellen und Forschungen*, VI., 32-52, 174-176, 374-388; and KALKOFF'S learned "*Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess*," Rome, 1905. It is surmised that the Archives of the Inquisition in Rome, so far inaccessible, may contain documents relating to it. KALKOFF (*Forschungen* 20) rightly denies a contrary assumption. As for myself, I have not been permitted to make any scientific researches among those Archives, but I have been assured by the archivist that there are no documents in them relating to the pontificate of Leo X. It could not be hoped to find any essentially new material, but diplomatic reports might supply information as regards the dispositions of the Curia. Such a report, taken from the State Archives, Modena, is given below.

to refrain from disseminating his new doctrines. If this were done at once, said the Pope, there was hope of extinguishing a fire so lately kindled; but should there be further delay, it might be found impossible to quench the conflagration.*

This attempt to check the innovator and bring him back to the Church by the discipline of his own Order,[†] was frustrated by Luther's determined resistance. For the purpose of justifying himself, he wrote with great care his "Resolutionen von der Kraft des Ablasses," which was forwarded to Rome by his religious superior, Staupitz. But in the apparently humble letter to Leo X. which accompanied it, he refused to make any retraction.[‡]

Luther had good reason to fear lest the Apostolic See might take more energetic measures against him. In order to be beforehand with Rome, he preached, in the middle of May, a sermon on the power of excommunication. In this, skilfully starting from the abuse of censures as carried on especially by subordinate ecclesiastics, and rightly condemned, he proceeded to lay down a new doctrine in startling contrast with that of the Church, namely, that the real communion of the Church was invisible, and that therefore no one could be cut off from it by excommunication, and that nothing but sin could affect it. § "All men wonder," wrote Luther to a friend,

* BEMBI, Epist., Leonis X., XVI., 18. Like all the letters of this collection, the one under discussion is laboured in style. In the original register of Bembo's Briefs, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (*cf.* the description and criticism of this autograph in Appendix, Vol. VIII., No. 22), this letter is missing, so that the original form cannot be established.

† *Cf.* KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 44 *seq.*

‡ Luther's works, Weimar ed., I., 527 *seq.*; ENDERS, I., 200-204. *Cf.* Riffel, I., 79 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 64 *seq.*

§ Sermo de virtute excommunicationis. Op. lat. varii, arg. II., 306 *seqq.*, Weimar ed., I., 638 *seqq.*

"that they have never heard of such a thing before. Meanwhile, whatever evil may befall me in the future, we may all hope that a new fire has been kindled. In this way the word of truth will become a sign of contradiction." *

One month later the canonical process against Luther was instituted in Rome. The watchful Dominicans, the faithful brethren of Tetzel, had drawn the attention of the Curia, as early as March, 1518, to the danger of Luther's proceedings; but no measures were taken until the middle of June, or, in other words, until the reception of Luther's letter refusing all recantation. Now for the first time the Papal fiscal-procurator, Mario di Perusco, brought a charge against the professor of Wittenberg of propagating false doctrines. Leo X. entrusted the preliminary inquiry to Girolamo Ghinucci, Bishop of Ascoli, the Auditor-General of legal causes to the Apostolic Camera.† The learned Master of the Sacred Palaces, Silvestro Mazzolini, better known as Prierias, from his native city, was appointed theological examiner of the case.‡ He was a Dominican,

* DE WETTE, I., 130; ENDERS, I., 212.

† See MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 47 *seq.*, and KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 50 *seq.* About Ghinucci, *cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 569 *seq.*

‡ For the life and general work of Prierias, *cf.* FR. MICHALSKI, *De Silvestri Prieriatis Ord. Praed. Magistri sacri Palatii (1456-1523) vita et scriptis*, Particula I. (*Diss. theol.*), *Monasterii Guestfal.*, 1892. *Cf.* WEISS in the *Histor.-polit. Bl.*, LXXIX., 192 *seqq.*, and KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 171 *seq.* The Brief of Dec. 16, 1515, in which Prierias was nominated Master of the Sacred Palaces, which is to be found in the last-mentioned work, is also to be found in *Arm.*, XLIV., t. 5, f. 76, Secret Archives of the Vatican. The literary contest between Prierias and Luther is treated detailedly by F. LAUCHERT'S article on "Die italienischen Gegner Luthers" in the "*Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Gesch. des deutschen Volkes.*" the statements in which are utilized by me in what follows. *Cf.* WEIDLUNG, *Schwedische Ref.-Gesch.*, 122, for a remarkable opinion of P. Magni about the writings of Prierias.

and an ardent disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas. The anti-thomist tone of Luther's theses stirred up within him the strongest feeling of antagonism. Immediately after they had been posted up at Wittenberg, he—as his office of Master of the Sacred Palaces constituted him supreme guardian of theological literature—had gone deeply into the subject of them. Consequently he was able at the shortest notice to put on paper his opinion of them, which was at once printed and sent with a dedication to Leo X.* The title of *Dialogus*, which was given to this work, written in bad Latin, is explained by its form. Luther's theses are placed in order, and to each the answer of Prierias is subjoined. To form a right estimate of the work of Prierias, we must bear in mind what he himself says in his dedication to the Pope and in his letter to Luther, namely, that in this, his first passage of arms with the Wittenberg professor, he had no intention of refuting the theses exhaustively. So long as Luther did not too prominently obtrude his *fundamenta*, but contented himself with putting forward his theses without trying to prove them, Prierias was content to meet him with counter-theses, which, according to his own convictions, met the case. Should Luther, however, go back on what he had said, try to prove and add to them, then Prierias held himself ready to enter the lists with an extended scheme. In order not to fall into the fault which he blamed in his adversary, and put the theses of the latter to the test, he summed up under four principal heads his essential propositions (funda-

* R. P. Fratris Silvestri Prieriatis . . . in praesumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate papae dialogus, 1518 (not 1517, *cf.* Luther's works, Weimar ed., I., 645); also in LÖSCHER, *Ref.-Acta*, II., 12-39; *cf.* MICHALSKI, 29 *seq.* In KÖHLER, *Luthers 95 Thesen*, we find the answers of Prierias to each individual thesis, with those of the German opponents (Wimpina-Tetzel, Eck) printed after each.

menta). These related to the Church, the supreme spiritual authority of the Pope as her Head, the infallibility of the Church, of General Councils, and of the Pope in decisions in matters of faith and morals, as also the heretical character of rebellion against the doctrines of the Church, whether expressly defined or actually existing. The infallibility of the Church was then asserted as regarded her doctrine of indulgences in all its branches; and on this ground he condemned Luther's attack on it. It is, however, a fact that, in spite of the excellence of most of his arguments against Luther's assertions, his overbearing manner led him into exaggerations in his defence.* It is much to be regretted that he should have allowed himself to make rude personal attacks, even if Luther's defenders had no right to find fault with their opponent on that score. Nevertheless, to suppose that a more gentle and considerate way of meeting the attack would have had any better results than his high-handed methods, would be to misapprehend Luther's character and to

* To Luther's 32nd thesis, "*Damnabuntur in aeternum cum suis magistris, qui per litteras veniarum securos se credunt de sua salute,*" Prierias answers: "*Qui per dictas litteras sine bonis operibus tutos se putant, fatui sunt; qui vero ex spirituali commodo eiusmodi litterarum concipiunt spem melius vivendi et moriendi et purgatorias poenas citius evadendi, recte sentiunt, et sic docentes recte docent.*" To the analogous thesis 52, "*Vana est fiducia salutis per litteras veniarum, etiamsi commissarius, immo papa ipse suam animam pro illis impignoret,*" he remarks: "*Vana est ista tua conclusio et similes, quia nullus est tam stultus, ut salutem suam talibus litteris committat sine voluntate poenitendi vel statim vel tandem.*" And when Luther says (thesis 76), "*Dicimus . . . quod veniae papales nec minimum venialium peccatorum tollere possint quoad culpam,*" as if the contrary had been preached to the people about the Indulgence, Prierias remarks that it is known to even the least instructed that the remission of guilt is presupposed for the gaining of an indulgence, for that all confess their sins before they try to gain it.

ignore the breach with the Church to which he had already committed himself in his own mind.*

At the beginning of July, 1518, Ghinucci and Prierias sent Luther an official summons to appear in person in Rome within sixty days, to give an account of his heretical doctrines and his contempt of the authority of the Pope. If he did not put in an appearance, he would be subjected to severe ecclesiastical penalties.† This summons, together with Prierias's pamphlet, was sent to Cardinal Cajetan at Augsburg, and were both placed in the hands of the Wittenberg professor at the beginning of August, when he set to work at once to compose a rejoinder. This reply to the "Dialogus" of Prierias, which Luther, in order to be beforehand with his adversaries, wrote in two days, was finished and printed by the end of August,‡ and is full of expressions of contempt for his opponents, as Italians and as Thomists. What Prierias says on the question, he writes, signifies absolutely nothing to him, and he rejects the teaching of St. Thomas with equal contempt. He acknowledges the canonical books of Scripture alone as infallible, and maintains that both Councils and Pope are subject to error. Nevertheless he holds firmly that the Roman Church has always maintained the true faith, and that it is necessary for all Christians to be in unity of faith with her.§ At the same time he repudiates any authority (unless a decision of the Church or a Council intervene) which

* The wild report that Leo X. was displeased with Prierias is all the less credible because, in his printed letter of July 21, 1520, the Pope acknowledged the greatness of the work of Prierias against Luther, and declares that he had written against him "canonice" in his *Dialogus*. See PAULUS, Tetzl, 164.

† MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 59 *seq.*

‡ Leipzig, 1518. In Luther's *Op. lat. var. arg.* II., 1 *seqq.*, in the Weimar ed., I., 647-686. In LÖSCHER, *Ref.-Acta*, II., 390-435.

§ LÖSCHER, II., 407; KÖHLER, 54.

forbids him to advocate his own views about indulgences. But even while facing the possibility of such a decision, he does not speak as though he would be willing to submit his own private opinions to it; for almost in the same breath he denies the infallibility equally of Council and Pope. Evidently he expects that the Church assembled in Council would agree with him.*

As soon as Luther had received his summons to appear in Rome, he wrote to his friend Spalatin, the Elector Frederick's court chaplain, and intimated to him that it was the duty of his suzerain to defend the honour of the University of Wittenberg which was being attacked in his person, "by his murderers, with vice and cunning." As regarded the "execrable summons through viperous and horrible instruments," the Elector of Saxony—who was then at the Diet of Augsburg—might obtain of the Pope through the Emperor, that his affair should be tried by "an impartial commission" in Germany. In the same sense Luther wrote directly to the Emperor to have a care for the honour of his University.† Maximilian, however, was not inclined to mix himself up in the matter. Under the influence of Cardinals Cajetan and Lang, and in the hopes of winning the Pope over to favour the election as King of Rome of his grandson Charles, the Emperor had written a most significant letter to Leo X. from Augsburg on the 5th of August, 1518. In this he had declared that, unless

* As a provisional reply to this work, Prierias published, without delay (in 1518), his "Replica ad F. Martinum Luther Ordinis Eremitarum" (as to its issue, *cf.* MICHALSKI, 30 *seq.*), in which, while maintaining a conciliatory tone and promising a fuller answer later, he merely refuted Luther's personal attacks on himself. Luther had his little work reprinted with a preface (*Op. lat. var. arg.*, 68-78, Weimar ed., II. 50-56) in 1519.

† *Cf.* DE WETTE, I., 131; ENDERS, I., 214.

Luther's new doctrines were met seriously, the unity of the Church would be in danger, and private judgment would be set up in opposition to the revealed truths of religion. He himself was prepared to ensure that any measures the Pope saw fit to take, to put a stop to these audacious and insidious disputations, should be duly carried out throughout the Empire, for the honour of God and the salvation of souls.*

This promise of the Emperor, which conveyed so much,† moved the Curia not to wait for the expiration of the term of sixty days set for Luther's appearance at Rome, but to pursue a course of greater energy. This is shown by the issue of the important Brief which was sent on the 23rd of August, 1518, to the learned Dominican, Cardinal Cajetan, who had been appointed Legate to the Diet of Augsburg on behalf of the affair of a Turkish war.‡ The news of further incriminating circumstances had reached Rome, said the Brief, and Luther had published fresh heresies. Cajetan was directed to call Luther—who had already been declared to be a heretic by Ghinucci—before him in

* RAYNALDUS, 1518, n. 90. Cf. EVERS, Luther, II., 116 *seq.*, and especially KALKOFF (Forschungen, 135 *seq.*), who was the first to realize the importance of the imperial letter and explain its origin.

† See KALKOFF, Prozess, 282. He here makes the pertinent remark: "This was, in fact, the announcement of an imperial law for putting into effect the ban of excommunication when sufficiently ready."

‡ In LÖSCHER, Ref.-Acta, II., 437, and in the Luther-Ausgaben, Weimar ed., II., 23 *seq.* As to the genuineness of this, declared to be apocryphal by Ranke, Waltz, and Maurenbrecher, see ULMANN, Studien, X., 1-13; MÜLLER, Prozess, 61-71; KALKOFF, Prozess, 274-279. The index at the end of the text in Müller, *loc. cit.*, 61 *seq.* The epitome in KÖSTLIN, I., 4, 232; KOLDE, I., 180 *seq.*, and others, is characterized by Müller as insufficient and misleading; Kawerau and KÖSTLIN, I., 5, are more accurate. The Brief of 23rd August, 1518, also in the Register of Bishop Brask; cf. MARTIN, G. Vasa, 222.

person, "as the case was notorious,* and by help of the Emperor and all spiritual and temporal princes, compel him to appear. Should Luther appear voluntarily and retract his errors with signs of repentance, then he should be forgiven. But should he not appear voluntarily, but wait to be compelled, and even so did not retract, then the Cardinal must arrest him and deliver him over to Rome, there to appear before the Pope. If Luther despised the secular arm, and refused to put himself in the power of the Legate, or, in other words, made it impossible for the secular authorities to hand him over and compel him to appear before the Legate, Cajetan was, in the first place, empowered to declare him and his followers heretics by public edict, and, secondly, to demand the assistance of all spiritual and temporal princes, the Emperor alone excepted, under threat of excommunication, to seize and deliver Luther over. If any of these princes should afford him shelter or help, advise or favour him, the very ground trodden by Luther was placed under interdict. These commands, especially that relating to extradition (*mandata requisitionis*), issued by Cajetan, were to be carried out by all authorities promptly and on the spot. To those who obeyed there was held out the prospect of a reward, to be given at the Legate's discretion." †

* *Tum ex fama tum ex facti permanentia.*

† Cf. K. MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 63 *seqq.*, who makes out that the Brief corresponds both in principle and practice with canon law; that the charge of "monstrosity," made by the enemies of truth, from Ranke onward, originates in ignorance of ecclesiastical ideas and principles, and is out of the question; and that therefore there is not the slightest ground for considering it apocryphal. The Brief "had this object in view before all others, to expedite matters as much as possible by the arrest of Luther, which was only a precautionary measure, and not to be considered as the first step towards executing the sentence" (MÜLLER, 66). As regarded the mandate of Cajetan, which provided that, in case

The more severe course against Luther, indicated in the Brief, was based on the notoriety and aggravation of his case. Rome, with a full appreciation of the gravity of the situation, had determined to take all means within reach to meet this dangerous movement. As the support of Maximilian could be relied on, there was every hope that, if the aged Emperor survived, this object might soon be attained.

At the same time (August 23, 1518) as this Brief, the Pope wrote to the Elector of Saxony requesting him to co-operate in handing Luther over to the Legate, as he

Luther refused to put himself into his power, he and his followers could notwithstanding be declared heretics, Müller points out that there is here no cause for the scandal taken by Protestants. The Brief, says he, does not even style Luther a heretic. It only says : " That the Pope has heard that Luther is preaching heretical doctrines ; that the auditor has declared Luther to be a heretic ; and that under certain circumstances Cajetan is authorised to pronounce him to be an excommunicated heretic. Therefore the expression which gives such offence is never once used directly." " Thus it is to be inferred that, in pursuance of the Brief, Cajetan could take those measures only in the event of Luther's disobeying the summons to appear before him, and evading the efforts of the spiritual and temporal authorities to hand him over, or, in other words, in the event of his making himself guilty of *contumacia*. This, once more, corresponds throughout with the principles and practice of canon law." " Seen thus, Cajetan's mission appears before us for the first time in a right light. The auditor Hieronymus had established the *diffamatio*. Thereupon Luther was summoned to Rome. Meanwhile, the notoriety of his heresy had been made manifest to the Pope himself ; and Cajetan was commissioned to once more summon Luther before him, either to enforce his submission, and thus end the affair, or else to hand him over to Rome to receive his sentence ; or, as a last alternative, should he refuse to appear at all, so that he could not be dealt with in person, to proclaim him publicly, in the name of the Pope, to be a heretic and excommunicate. With that the trial would have ended, for he could not appeal *notorium judici*" (Müller, 67-68).

was spreading the most pernicious doctrines.* The issue of this Brief led to intimate personal dealings between the Cardinal-Legate and the Elector. Frederick refused positively to deliver Luther over to Rome. He wished that the case should be tried in Germany before impartial judges. Cajetan could not agree to this; though he declared himself ready, if only Luther would appear before him at Leipzig, to treat him with paternal gentleness. The Elector regarded this conciliatory proposal as an important concession; but, as will be seen later, he put an entirely different construction on the expression "paternal gentleness" from that intended by the Cardinal.†

If Cajetan did really, in the further course of the proceedings, promise to accede to the Elector's demands, and to pardon Luther without compelling him to retract, he was most certainly acting contrary to his instructions. No doubt he did provide "for the event that Luther might refuse to recant, and it might be necessary to allow him to return to Saxony, by extracting a promise from the Elector, that he would not expose himself to the censures of the Church by favouring Luther in a way forbidden in the Brief. He implored of Frederick not to disgrace the good name of his ancestors for the sake of a miserable monk. Frederick repeatedly made the promise thus asked of him, and Cajetan believed that he had thus secured the extradition of Luther." But his calculations were at fault, for the Elector took a different view of what constituted the good name of his family from that taken by Cajetan. From the very beginning he had been determined to take

* LUTHERI, *Op. lat. var. arg.*, II., 352-354. As to the very variable drafts of the original, see EVERS, *Luther*, II. 102; ULMANN, *Studien*, X., 5-6. For a simultaneous attempt to obtain the co-operation of his Order in procuring Luther's arrest, see KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 54 *seq.*

† KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 150 *seq.*

active measures against Luther only in the event of his doctrines being proved false to his own satisfaction. That the Cardinal went so far to meet the "lukewarm policy" of Frederick, is most easily explained by his confidence in the theological superiority of his position, which made him hope to arrive by scientific methods at conclusions before which his adversary would be compelled to yield.* A man entirely devoted to study, without much practical knowledge of the world, the Cardinal was no match for such an expert politician as the Elector of Saxony.

In consideration of the excited state of feeling in Germany, and the importance of Frederick in the matter of the election of the King of Rome, Leo X. assented to the arrangements, taken as a whole, which he and Cajetan had come to, and left to his Legate to bear alone the risk of overstepping his instructions. A Brief of the 11th of September gave Cajetan the dangerous power of examining and deciding on Luther's case at Augsburg.†

Luther, encouraged by his own suzerain and provided by him with recommendations, decided to obey the summons to Augsburg, where he arrived on the 7th of October. Thrice, on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of October, he, having prudently provided himself with an imperial safe-conduct, appeared before the Cardinal-Legate, who had, in view of the coming disputations, studied the subject of them deeply.

From the first Cajetan received Luther—as is admitted by the latter in his letters‡—in a gentle and friendly

* See KALKOFF, *loc. cit.*, whose explanations follow.

† *Cf.* KALKOFF, 58 *seq.*, 150 *seq.*

‡ For Luther's report of his dealings with Cajetan: *Acta D. M. Lutheri apud Card. S. Sixti*; *Op. lat. var. arg.*, II., Weimar ed., II., 1 *seqq.* *Cf.* RIFFEL, I., 104 *seqq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 71 *seq.*; MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 68 *seqq.*; DIECKHOFF, 204 *seqq.*

manner, explaining that he had not summoned him to appear before him as his judge. It is true that, as the discussion went on, Cajetan could not control his indignation at Luther's obstinacy. In the name of the Pope he demanded of the Wittenberg professor to think better of his ways and retract his errors, and to promise, furthermore, never to return to them, and refrain henceforward from meddling with doctrines which were opposed to the authority of the Roman Church. He asked him especially to retract the fifty-eighth thesis, which denied that the merits of Christ and of the Saints formed the treasury of the Church, as also that sentence in his "Resolutions" which made a salutary reception of the sacraments conditional on the faith of the recipient. Luther wished thereon to enter into a lengthy and learned disputation with the Cardinal; but, in accordance with his instructions,* Cajetan would not be drawn into this, and broke off the first conference with a fatherly warning to Luther to renounce his errors.

At the second interview, on the following day, Luther was accompanied by Staupitz, who had in the interval arrived at Augsburg. He also brought with him a notary and several witnesses. The notary read out a declaration on behalf of Luther, that as far as he could remember he had never taught anything against Holy Scripture, the doctrines of the Church, the Papal Decretals, or sound reason. But as he was a man subject to error, he submitted himself to the decisions of the Holy Church and to all who knew better than he did. He wished to speak openly in answer to all charges and, finally, to submit to the decisions of the Universities of Basle, Freiburg, Louvain, and Paris.† The Legate did not agree to the

* Cf. KALKOFF, 59.

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 72 *seq.*

last request, by which Luther "wished to wrest the affair from the Pope's hands, and again give it the aspect of a scholastic quarrel, thus to gain time." However, urged by Staupitz, he ended by granting the request that Luther might hand in a written vindication. In this, which he handed in on the third day, October the 14th, Luther criticized Clement the Sixth's Extravagant, *Unigenitus*, which Cajetan had proposed to him as a definition of the Catholic doctrine of the treasury of the Church.* He maintained that a construction could be placed on it which would leave nothing to condemn in him. In the second place, Luther defended the doctrine of the necessity of faith for justification and for the reception of Communion. Being convinced of the infallible truth of his own opinions, he demanded that a better knowledge of Holy Scripture should be brought to bear against what he considered irrefragable arguments; and without this he refused to retract. But again Cajetan declined to allow himself to be drawn into an argument, and at parting bade him not return until he was in a better mind.†

The Cardinal then tried to work on Luther through Staupitz, and induce him to yield. By the persuasion of Staupitz and Wenzel Link, Luther then wrote a letter to

* DE WETTE, I., 149-158; Op. lat. ver. arg., II., 372 *seqq.*; ENDERS, I., 250 *seqq.*

† RIFFEL, I., 107 *seq.*: "The Cardinal could do no less than dismiss with indignation a man who declared his own opinion to be absolutely identical with Christian truth, and he himself another Jeremias or Paul. When he declared himself ready to make submission, he understood it to mean that the Church must be ready to adopt his subjective views, for he regarded himself as the equal of the whole Church, the question between them having to be decided solely by Christ, or rather the dead word of Holy Scripture, which alone has authority in the Church, which is bound by no man and is quite free, a King of kings and Lord over all."

Cajetan on the 17th of October,* in which, with an outward show of profound respect, he extolled the Cardinal's gentleness and friendliness, and admitted that he had spoken too violently and disrespectfully against the Pope, for which he asked pardon and promised amendment. He also promised to keep silence thenceforward on the subject of indulgences, if the same were imposed on his adversaries. But he refused to comply with the primary condition, namely, that of making retractation of his errors, which, said he, his conscience forbade him to do, and against his conscience he dare not act. The authority of St. Thomas and the other scholastics, he went on to say, did not suffice for him, nor did their reasons convince him: he must be convinced by more cogent reasons than theirs. He begged Cajetan to refer the matter to the Pope, so that it might be decided by the Church, and he might know what to retract and what to adhere to. If now he retracted what was a matter of doubt, he laid himself open to the reproach of maintaining or retracting that about which he knew nothing. Obviously the Cardinal could not be satisfied with any such declaration. By accepting it he would have admitted that on all those points on which Luther had defied the authority of the Church, only those doctrines were at stake which, "not being defined by the Church, were open to reasonable discussion."

In a later letter of the 18th of October, Luther declared† that, having proved his obedience by his long and laborious journey to obey the summons to appear before the Legate, and having expressed his submission to any future judgment of the Holy See by giving up his "Resolutions," he

* DE WETTE, I., 161-163; ENDERS, I., 263 *seq.* Cf. RIFFEL, I., 108; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 79; DIECKHOFF, 224 *seq.*

† DE WETTE, I., 163-165; ENDERS, I., 266 *seq.* Cf. RIFFEL, I., 109; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 80.

now considered that a longer sojourn in Augsburg was unnecessary, and burdensome both to himself and to the Carmelites with whom he was staying; that, moreover, the Cardinal had forbidden him to reappear before him so long as he refused to recant; and on that subject he had made himself clear in his former letter. Now, therefore, he would take his departure. He went on to say that he appealed from the Legate and from the Pope, badly informed, to one who would be better informed, who would be pointed out to him by the Most High. He had, he said, no fear of censures, which he had not deserved, for by God's grace he was in such a condition that he feared condemnation much less than he feared error and false opinions; for he knew that censure could not harm him, but would rather benefit him if he had on his side truth and a sound faith.

Two days later, in the night between the 20th and 21st of October, Luther, having been released by Staupitz from rule and obedience, fled secretly from Augsburg, and arrived in Wittenberg on the 31st. During his journey he received news of the Brief sent by the Pope to Cajetan on the 23rd of August, a copy of which Spalatin had contrived to procure secretly.*

The purport of the manifesto mentioned above, the rough draft of which he had given to his notary and witnesses on the 16th of October, to be publicly affixed to the door of the Cathedral of Augsburg after his departure, and sent to the Cardinal, was as follows: There was much that was uncertain about the matter of indulgences, as well as about the manner in which they can be applied to the dead; therefore a discussion on the subject is not only permissible but praiseworthy. This he undertook to promote, moved thereto by the immoderate stir made by the preachers of indulgences, who, under pretext of carrying out their mission,

* KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, II *seq.*

carried on a scandalous and covetous trade to an unprecedented extent, which brought contempt on the Roman Church, the power of the keys, and the Apostolic See. He had therefore submitted the matter under dispute not only to the judgment of the Church, but to the intelligence of those who knew and understood it better than he did. But first of all he had submitted it to his most Holy Father and Lord, the present Pope Leo X. In spite of this he had been calumniated and held up to hatred by certain children of mammon, gluttonous misers who hungered after the milk and the wool of Christ's lamb, just as if he had done anything to bring discredit and dishonour on the Church and the power of the keys. For reasons of importance he had not obeyed the summons to appear in person in Rome, nor could he make the retractation demanded of him by the very learned and friendly Cajetan, because the points on which he was supposed to be in error had not been pointed out to him. As he had affirmed nothing but only discussed, as he had submitted everything to the most Holy Father, Leo X., in whose voice he recognized that of Christ, and as he had no intention of saying or believing anything except what had been proved by Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, and the canons, he appealed from this Pope, who was badly informed, and from the judges chosen by him (Prierias and Ghinucci, whom he rejected as prejudiced) to a Pope who should be better informed, and to the protection of whom he submitted himself and his actual and future followers. He reserved to himself the right to make in this present appeal, changes, additions, and improvements.*

Cajetan was painfully affected by Luther's flight, as well as by the contents of his manifesto. On the 25th of

* Luther's works, Weimar ed., II., 28 *seq.* ; RIFFEL, I., 111 *seq.* Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 74-79.

October he wrote to the Elector of Saxony,* and briefly told him all that had occurred, entreating him to send Luther to Rome or at least to banish him from his State. Frederick at once forwarded this letter to Luther. In his answer to Cajetan, on the 18th of December, 1518,† the Elector refused the Legate's request. He was not, he said, as yet convinced that the professor of Wittenberg had fallen into heresy. Had this been so, he would have done his duty as a Christian prince; but as it was, any action against Luther would only injure his University.‡ Thus was Cajetan's mission frustrated.

Luther had no doubt that his condemnation would follow; and on the 28th of November he issued another address in which he appealed from the Pope, who was subject to error, to a future General Council.§ Even before taking this step, earlier in November he had printed a report of his interviews with Cajetan; and in this also can be seen the development and accentuation of his attitude towards the Papacy.|| In forwarding this document to Wenzel Link on the 11th of December, Luther says: "I send you my trifling work that you may see whether I am not right

* Cf. ENDERS, I., 269 *seq.*; RIFFEL, I., 112; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 81 *seq.*; KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 19.

† See KALKOFF, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen dem Kurfürsten Friedrich und Kajetan*, in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVIII., 325 *seq.*

‡ ENDERS, I., 310 *seqq.*

§ Luther's works, Weimar ed., II., 36 *seq.* Cf. RIFFEL, I., 119 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 86-88. HERGENRÖTHER, *loc. cit.*, justly remarks: "This was a weapon which could serve only for the moment; for he had several times declared, especially in his reply to Silvestro Prierias, that Councils also could err; and it could be foreseen that he would not submit to any conciliar pronouncement, if unfavourable to him, any more than he would to that of the Pope, to whom he had given such solemn assurances of submission."

|| Cf. DIECKHOFF, 227-230.

in supposing that, according to Paul, the real Antichrist holds sway over the Roman court. I think I can prove that this last is worse than any Turk."* The Sermon on Penance, belonging to about this time (November, 1518), shows how far his protest about indulgences had carried him in the direction of his new doctrine of justification by faith alone.†

On receiving the report of the transactions between Cardinal Cajetan and Luther at Augsburg, Leo sent to the Legate a constitution about the doctrine of indulgences, bearing the date of the 9th of November, 1518. So that henceforward no one should be able to excuse himself on the plea of ignorance, it was here laid down as the doctrine of the Catholic Church that, by virtue of the power of the keys, the Pope can remit both the guilt and punishment due to actual sins—the guilt by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment by indulgences; and that he can, as occasion arises, draw from the overflowing treasury of the merits of Christ and His Saints, and grant remissions to faithful Christians whether they are in this life or in purgatory, united to Christ by love. He grants (*conferre*) this to the living *per modum absolutionis*, or assigns (*transfere*) it to the dead *per modum suffragii*; therefore all who obtain these indulgences are freed from that amount of temporal punishment which is in proportion with the indulgence granted and obtained. This is what all must teach and preach under penalty of excommunication; and Bishops are directed to make this constitution known in all places. The name of Luther was not, out of consideration, mentioned in the document, the only reference to

* DE WETTE, I., 192 *seq.*; ENDERS, I., 317. Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 89; *ibid.* for similar and subsequent utterances which show that by that time Luther had fully formulated his proposition that the Pope was antichrist. Cf. also PAULUS in *Der Katholik*, 1899, I., 479.

† Cf. DIECKHOFF, 231-241.

him being at the beginning, where it is said that certain religious in Germany have by their sermons disseminated false doctrines about indulgences, which have from time immemorial been granted by the Holy See.*

Cajetan received this important Bull at Linz in Austria. He published it there on the 13th of December, and at once had copies spread throughout Germany. But the results were small, for Luther's appeal had preceded it, and had to no small degree weakened its effect. Moreover, the preaching of the Indulgence was unpopular, and nearly all through the country the people saw in it nothing but a contrivance on the part of the covetous Curia for enriching themselves, and of the equally hated Dominicans, who were supposed to have extorted the Bull from Rome.† Luther's attack on indulgences seemed to thousands to be perfectly justifiable, and he himself was regarded as the champion of necessary ecclesiastical reforms in the Church.

Connected with Cajetan's failure to amicably terminate the difference with Luther, was the mission of the Saxon nobleman and Papal private chamberlain Karl von Miltitz.‡ The real object of the mission of this superficial, frivolous, and vain courtier,§ which was, throughout, quite in harmony

* Printed in KAPP, *Sammlung*, 457-467 (with German translation, 467-481); LÖSCHER, II., 493 *seqq.* Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 89; MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 74 *seq.*; and KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 14 *seq.*, 67. Kalkoff believes that this Bull was written from a draft sent by Cajetan.

* HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 89.

† Cf. J. R. SEIDEMANN, *Miltitz*, Dresden, 1844; DIECKHOFF, 242-256; RIFFEL, I., 123-134; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 89-93; PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 70 *seqq.*; and Brieger and Kalkoff as quoted in Müller's *Spezialstudien*.

‡ KALKOFF (*Prozess*, 286) speaks justly of "the humbug of this vain, garrulous, and avaricious man." MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 76, calls him "a braggart and humbug."

with his consequential attitude, has been much overrated, though it was in reality quite a subordinate affair.* He was the bearer of the Golden Rose which had been for so long the object of the Elector of Saxony's desire, and which he was directed to leave provisionally at Augsburg with the Legate. He was qualified for this mission by his relations with the Spanish court, and was directed to try to ascertain the Elector's intentions as regarded Luther, and procure his extradition. But throughout these transactions he was only a subordinate agent, with no right to work independently of the sanction of the Cardinal-Legate, without whose express permission he might not convey to the Elector the token of Papal favour.† Still less could he "even subordinately" make an attempt "to arrange the Lutheran affair as far as possible," or "influence Luther in a conciliatory way," or, in a word, carry out all that he interpreted as belonging to his ostensible mission.‡ If, notwithstanding this, Miltitz did actually enter into such negotiations with Luther as have connected him for all time with the history of the disorders of that period, he did so without authority, and entirely on his own account, under the influence of his desire for importance.

In the beginning of January, 1519, negotiations were entered into at Altenburg, in which Miltitz tried to persuade the Wittenberg professor to agree to an accom-

* Such is the result of MÜLLER'S most recent researches (Prozess, 86 *seq.*), and KALKOFF, Prozess, 279 *seq.*, 285 *seq.*

† He was so completely subordinate to Cajetan, says K. MÜLLER (*loc. cit.*), "that we must think that the character of the braggart and humbug was well known in Rome, who made use of him for the moment only, because he knew the country and people as a Saxon noble, who claimed kinship with the Elector." The faculties Miltitz brought with him were limited. See KALKOFF, Forschungen, 180 *seq.*

‡ KALKOFF, Prozess, 286.

modation which must then be submitted to Rome. The result of these transactions, which is usually estimated too high, was nothing more than that Luther pledged himself to keep silence for the future on the subject of indulgences, if his adversaries would on their side do the same; and that he agreed with Miltitz that the latter should approach the Pope with a request to entrust the settlement of the whole affair to a German Bishop.* On the 10th of January, 1519, Luther was again in Wittenberg. From Altenburg Miltitz went to Leipzig, where, in his braggart way, although without any authority, he bore himself in an arrogant and harsh way towards Tetzel, on whose behalf the Provincial of the Order, Hermann Rab, had already written to him at Altenburg on the 3rd of January, 1519. Tetzel fell ill from worry, and Luther was generous enough to console him. "Let him not trouble himself," said he, "for it was not he who had begun the affair: but the child has quite a different father."†

* In this we follow BRIEGER, in the *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XV., 204 *seqq.*, with whom KALKOFF, *loc. cit.*, 399 *seq.*, and K. MÜLLER, *Kirchengesch.*, II., 1, 231, agree. It is usually accepted that a conclusion was arrived at on four points: (1) that both sides should henceforward keep silence; (2) that Luther's case should be submitted to the judgment of a German Bishop (according to Spalatin's proposal to the Archbishop of Salzburg); (3) that he should provide a written statement, in order that there should be no misconception as to his earlier works, and should exhort the people to obey the Roman See; (4) that he should admit in a letter of apology to the Pope that he had been too violent. So says KAWERAU, *Reformation und Gegenreformation* (1894), 15, in which he agrees with the whole later Lutheran researches (BRIEGER, *loc. cit.*, 204). In reality the negotiations turned on these points, though in the final settlement only the above-mentioned is produced.

† PAULUS, *Tetzel*, 70 *seq.*, 169. Tetzel died at Leipzig on the 11th of August, 1519. Cf. CLEMEN in *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*, LXXIV. (1901), 127.

In Luther's letter of March 3rd to Leo X., about which so much has been said, many have tried to trace the fruit of a concession extracted by Miltitz at Altenburg.* In his letter to the Pope, the Wittenberg professor asseverates "that it had never been in his mind to attack the authority of the Roman Church or the Pope. On the contrary, he acknowledged that the authority of the Roman Church surpasses all other, and that nothing in heaven or on earth, save only Jesus Christ, is to be put above it." As at that time Luther had reached that stage in his apostasy when he had declared the Pope to be Antichrist, and as shortly after the date of this letter he wrote to Spalatin saying that he had not made up his mind whether the Pope were Antichrist or only his emissary,† the falseness of his submissive letter to Leo X. is painfully apparent. As is shown by the latest researches,‡ the original draft which is still existing was written, not on the 3rd of March, but as early as the 5th or 6th of January, during his sojourn at Altenburg. It remained in the form of a draft, for when the letter was laid before him, Miltitz declared it to be insufficient, because, in spite of its submissive language, there was no mention in it of retraction. The document appears in a better light seen thus, as regards honesty of intention; but looked at as being of two months' earlier origin, its contradiction with his assertion in December, that he believed the Pope to be Antichrist, is most glaring. Eck's appearance did not at first lead Luther so far, this "was only an inducement to him to express more openly the

* DE WETTE, I., 233-235; ENDERS, I., 442-445. Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 93 *seq.*

† DE WETTE, I., 239; ENDERS, I., 450.

‡ BRIEGER in the *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XV., 204-221. PAULUS, Luther's position towards the Papacy in the first months of 1519, *Katholik*, 1899, I., 476-480. Cf. KALKOFF, *Proz.*, 401.

hostility to the Pope, which he had been for so long cherishing within his heart.”*

The following circumstances, and especially the disputation in Leipzig in June and July, 1519, together with the correspondence connected with it, put Luther before us as moving with more and more certainty along the road which led to open apostasy from the Church. It is remarkable that during this time, in fact until the autumn, no further steps were taken in Rome about the matter, with the exception of the Pope's Brief to Luther on the 29th of March, 1519. In this it is said that “the Pope, delighted with Luther's repentant submission, invites him graciously to set forth at once for Rome, there to make the retraction which he postponed when before the Legate.”† But, meanwhile, the unreliable Miltitz was left for three parts of the year to play his own part as mediator, without any important results ensuing in the second negotiations with Luther at Liebenwerda on the 9th of October,‡ or in those with the Elector of Treves about arranging an accommodation by arbitration.§

That the endeavours of Miltitz to mediate could only injure the Catholic cause, is undoubted. The fact that this man was given a free hand, and that nevertheless nothing

* PAULUS, *loc. cit.*, 479, against Brieger, who believes in an interior development in Luther's attitude towards the Papacy between January and March 13th, 1519. The book published by Luther at the end of February, under the title of “Unterricht auf etliche Artikel, so ihm von seinen Abgönnern aufgelegt und zugemessen worden,” was, according to common acceptation, a consequence of the Altenburg concession. In fact, it had nothing to do with it, but was written as a simple defence. Cf. BRIEGER, *loc. cit.*, 212–218. For a judgment of the Letter of Jan. 1519, see GRISAR, *Luther gegenüber dem Gesetze der Wahrhaftigkeit*, in the *Zeitschr. f. Kathol. Theol.*, 1905, 421 *seq.*

† ENDERS, I., 492 *seq.*; KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 407; and *Forschungen*, 69.

‡ SEIDEMANN, *loc. cit.*, 17 *seq.*

§ KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 411 *seqq.*, 421 *seqq.*

was done against Luther till the autumn of 1519, is most significant. It is not difficult to find an explanation. Meanwhile, the political considerations which impeded the progress of an affair so important to the Church are highly characteristic of the Medici Pope.* The imperial election reduced everything else to insignificance. In face of the absorbing interest taken by Leo X. in this question, the Lutheran business fell into the background as a matter of subordinate importance. It seemed, rather, advisable to let it rest for a while, for political motives demanded the greatest consideration towards the influential and highly-respected Elector of Saxony, who was for a time the Pope's favourite candidate for the imperial throne. Thus alone can be explained the announcement, in the Brief of the 29th of March, of Luther's supposed readiness to recant, resting on the authority of the subordinate and unreliable Miltitz, and why that envoy was allowed to pursue his own way, which bound the commissaries to nothing. Thus time was gained by the enemy, and a definite settlement avoided. Attempts were made to temporize

* HAGEN (II., 107 *seq.*) declared this; and later KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 288 *seq.*, 402 *seq.*, after he had had access to all sources of information. He remarks on p. 288 *seq.*: "The Curia must not be made responsible for the mistakes of Miltitz. His project, zealously carried out, was shipwrecked as soon as it turned out that the Elector would not deliver up Luther, simply because he was told that his doctrines were notorious and to be condemned; and that the only remaining means of coercion, the issue of an imperial mandate, seemed for the time to be very remote. With the rivalry about the imperial crown, the political situation was quite changed. . . . Herein lies the explanation of the remarkable attitude of the Curia, which, after the procedure decided on in the last months, suddenly let the reins fall, as it were, from their hands, and for three-quarters of a year allowed their emissary, appointed on a merely temporary mission, to carry on as he chose his visionary, shallow, and fantastic projects of reconciliation."

in this all-important matter, and opportunities of an infinitude of good were missed. Meanwhile, the waves of the anti-Papal agitation rose higher and higher, yet nothing was done by Rome!

It was only when the election question had been settled that the influential Cardinal Giulio de' Medici urged that the Luther affair should be brought to a conclusion. The Cardinal had returned to Rome at the beginning of October, 1519, and it was only then that the renewal of Luther's trial was taken in hand. Eck had already reported about the Leipzig disputation, and had warned the Pope not to defer such an important matter.* It had all along been his intention to go to Rome,† to place before the Pope the real state of affairs, in the place of Miltitz's misleading and highly-coloured reports, when he was forestalled by his appointment by Leo X., and he set forth on his journey on the 18th of January, 1520.‡

Eck had a great share in the energetic prosecution of the cause, even if his interposition had not such decisive effects as we might be led to suppose by his boastful words. Before he arrived on the scene, such prompt and strong measures had been already taken in the matter, that it seemed as if those concerned wished to make up in one moment for the delay of months. In open Consistory, by the express command of the Pope, the process against Luther was renewed on the 9th of January, 1520, the proceedings being now extended against the Elector of Saxony as his protector. An Italian member of the Curia employed all the force of his eloquence in bringing against the Elector the charges of obstinacy, cruelty, and tyranny, by which he had kindled a fire which it would be very

* Cf. KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 432 *seq.*, 434.

† WIEDEMANN, *Dr. Joh. Eck*, 149 *seq.*

‡ WIEDEMANN, 150.

difficult to quench. It was to be feared, he said, that the Elector, in combination with the mortal enemies of the Holy See, would seduce all Germany by his errors. The orator moved that efficacious steps should be taken against this hydra. The Pope must give full powers to the Auditor of the Camera to take all legal measures to ensure the coercion of Luther and his followers, and compel them to give an account of their religious opinions; failing which, they should be declared to be heretics. Religion was undone, said he in conclusion, unless the evil were grasped in its beginning and the incurable wound cauterized.*

Accordingly, in preparation for the final sentence, the Pope appointed a commission in the beginning of February, chiefly composed of Franciscan Observantines, under the learned Cardinals Accolti and Cajetan, who were charged permanently with the conduct of the affair. At the first sitting of the commission a summary of Luther's false doctrines, drawn up by one of the Louvain Dominicans, was read out. This session had a very short existence, for those who composed it wished to go too fast.† On the 11th of February a second commission of theologians was formed, which sat till the middle of March. It recommended the publication of a Bull against Luther's writings, but the sparing of him in person. It made a careful distinction between the degrees of objection to be taken to the new doctrines.‡ But this more gentle mode of

* See the report of M. VON WATT in the *Mittel. d. histor. Vereins von St. Gallen*, XXV., 265 *seq.* Cf. SCHULTE, *Quellen und Forschungen*, VI., 174 *seqq.*; KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 95; and *Forschungen*, 15 *seq.*, 37 *seq.*, 71 *seq.*

† See SCHULTE in *Quellen und Forschungen*, VI., 43 *seq.*; KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 99 *seq.*, 580, n. 3.

‡ SANUTO, XXVIII., 260, 376. Cf. KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 101 *seq.* 581, n.

procedure did not receive the consent of Leo X. As Eck had arrived in Rome in the middle of March, the assumption is justified that his influence was at work in this.* A new commission, presided over by the Pope in person, then took the case in hand.

While Rome was still considering what had best be done, Luther declared most unequivocally his complete secession from the Church, about which he had in reality made up his mind long before. His position was completely changed by his alliance with the humanists, who detested the Church, and the revolutionary forces, represented by Ulrich von Hutten. The espousal of Luther's cause by the anti-Catholic humanists was of the very gravest importance. These men, who had been trained in feuds and disputes, were strong in speech and with their pens, and as they had done in the case of Reuchlin, so now were they ready to do everything in their power to assist Luther. With their co-operation the difference with the Church, which had originally been theological, assumed quite a different character. At the head of these deadly enemies of the "Papists" stood Ulrich von Hutten.

Hutten, who was by nature revolutionary, had, in spite of his hostility to Rome, looked down with contempt on Luther, and in the whole affair of his difference with the Church had seen nothing but a miserable monkish squabble. His eyes were opened by the Leipzig disputation, when Luther was pressed for the first time to make a distinct declaration of his heretical views about Pope and Council. He saw the purpose to which this monk, whom he had hitherto so underrated, could be turned. Thenceforward Luther's cause was his own. With all the passion of his undisciplined nature, he took Luther's part, and tried to further his cause among the masses of the people. Hutten's

former hatred of Rome now assumed really fearful proportions. His dialogue, "Vadiscus, or the Roman Trinity," contains, according to his own verdict, the strongest things that have ever been written against Rome. As a characteristic of her he drew the revolting picture of "a gigantic, blood-sucking worm." If, said he, Germany has not the strength to free itself, then let the Turks execute judgment on Rome; for in her there stands "the great barn of the universe, into which is garnered all that has been robbed and taken from other nations. In the midst sits that insatiable corn-weevil which devours piles of fruit, surrounded by its many fellow-gluttons, who, having first sucked our blood and then consumed our flesh, are now seeking to grind our bones and devour all that is left of us. Will not the Germans take up their arms, and make an onslaught on them with fire and sword?"*

Under Hutten's influence Luther took up national and revolutionary ideas. Instead of holding theological discussions, he now issued pamphlets and preached revolution to the people, not only in ecclesiastical but also in political matters. The whole movement assumed quite a new character. All the inflammable material which had been piling itself up for years now broke out into open flame. Cleverly chosen battle-cries, such as Fatherland! Liberty! Gospel! carried away the masses of the people.

While Hutten developed this really superhuman activity, Luther was not far behind him. The effects of his popular oratory became more and more apparent. He took Hutten as his model and often appropriated his very words. No longer can we find any trace of diffidence. When, on the 11th of June, the knight, Silvester von Schaumburg, offered to bring up a hundred nobles to protect him, he wrote to

* See STRAUSS, Hutten, II., 35 *seq.* Cf. HAGEN, II., 55 *seq.*; BEZOLD, Reformation, 289.

Spalatin saying : " I have cast the diè ; I now despise the rage of the Romans as much as I do their favour. I will not reconcile myself to them for all eternity, nor have anything to do with them. Let them condemn and burn all that belongs to me. In return, I also will do as much for them ; otherwise I could not kindle the fire that is to condemn and burn, before the eyes of the world, the whole Papal system—that Lernæan hydra of heresy. Then there will be an end to this show of humility, which has proved so fruitless, about which I will no longer permit the enemy of the gospel to become puffed up." "Silvester von Schaumburg and Franz von Sickingen have freed me from all human respect." "Franz von Sickingen," he says in a letter to a fellow-Augustinian, "promises to protect me through Hutten from all my enemies. Silvester von Schaumburg will do the same with his Franconian nobles. I have had a beautiful letter from him. Now I no longer fear, and am publishing a book in the German tongue about Christian reform, directed against the Pope, in language as violent as if I were addressing Antichrist."*

Thousands of copies of this book, which was written in the beginning of August, were spread all over Germany. It bore the title : "An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung."† In his programme of reform, the writer skilfully combines a thoroughly laudable social reform with demands relating to the Church which would upset the whole of the actual condition of ecclesiastical law. In these demands relating to the Church lie the kernel of the book, which has been described

* See DE WETTE, I., 466, 469, 475 ; ENDERS, II., 432 *seq.*, 443.

† Luther's works, Weimar ed., VI., 381 *seqq.* Special edition with commentary by K. Benrath, Halle, 1884. Cf. W. KÖHLER, *Luthers Schrift und der christliche Adel deutscher Nation*, in the *Spiegel der Kultur und Zeitgesch.*, Halle, 1895.

as "revolution pictured in grand style and with vigorous strokes, as though it were the normal state of things."*

"Three walls have been built round the Church," says Luther: (1) the distinction between clergy and laity; (2) the right of the Church to interpret Scripture; (3) the right of the Pope to summon a Council. These walls, built of straw and paper, must, says he, be overthrown. All Christians are priests; all have an equal right to expound Scripture; a Council should be summoned by the temporal powers, so that Germany may be set free "from the Roman robber and from his shameful and devilish rule." Rome sucks the Germans so dry that "it is a matter for wonder that we have still something left to eat." "O noble princes," he cries, "how long will you forsake your country and people to be the prey of these ravening wolves?" Instead of fighting the Turks in the East, you should rather attack "those who are at your very doors."

Combined with this appeal for an attack to be made on "the Romanists," Luther makes some positive and practical suggestions. The German Bishops, instead of being mere ciphers and tools of the Pope, should be free and subject only to the Archbishop of Mayence, as the Primate of Germany. The grievances should be abolished, holidays, pilgrimages, fasts, and ecclesiastical censures done away with, mendicant orders reduced, the care of the poor organized, the celibacy of the clergy abandoned. On the other hand, cathedral benefices should remain as a provision for the younger sons of the nobles. In the same way as this clause was intended to be a sop to the nobility, so was the subsequent proposal, to confiscate the States of the Church and do away with the Papal suzerainty over Naples, intended to win the favour of the Emperor.

§ BEZOLD, *Reformation*, 292 ; *cf.* 295.

The effect of this book, written in the vernacular and in vigorous style, was very powerful and far-reaching. The first edition of four thousand copies was exhausted in a very short time, and new impressions had to be set in hand at once to satisfy the eager demand. By his advocacy of economic changes and his severe attitude towards capitalization, luxury, and immorality, Luther won the sympathy of the multitudes for the ecclesiastical reforms recommended in this work, which were nevertheless "nothing but a flourish of trumpets directed against the actual position of the Papacy."* The hostility to Rome, which was already so widely spread over Germany, now advanced with unprecedented rapidity.

A postscript to his book, addressed to the German nobles, which completed his breach with the Church, was intended as an answer to the *Epitoma responsionis* of Prierias.† He had this work, originally published in Perugia, reprinted with a preface and postscript as well as marginal notes. The preface and postscript contained his violent repudiation of the Papacy as such. If, says he, such doctrines as were expressed by Prierias about the authority of the Pope, were taught in Rome, then he, Luther, openly declared that Antichrist sat there in the temple of God, and that the Roman Curia was the synagogue of Satan. He extolled as blessed the Greeks, Bohemians, and all who had separated themselves from this Babylon. If the Pope and Cardinals did not restrain that mouth of Satan (*i.e.* Prierias), and force him to retract, he himself would renounce the Roman Church, together with the Pope and Cardinals, as the abomination of desolation seated in the holy place.

* Such is the judgment of K. MÜLLER, *Kirchengesch.*, II., 1, 244.

† The *Epitoma* was intended to be the precursor of a greater work, in which Prierias hoped to meet and overthrow his adversary by scientific methods.

In his postscript he in so many words called for a religious war and the waging of a bloody persecution against the Catholic Church. "If," he says, "the madness of the Romanists be continued, it seems to me that the only hope of salvation left is that Emperor, kings, and princes take up arms and attack this pest of the earth, and thus bring matters to a conclusion, no longer by words but by steel. . . . If a thief is punished by a halter, a murderer by the sword, and a heretic by fire, why should not we, with all our weapons, attack these teachers of corruption, these Popes, Cardinals, and all the rabble of the Roman Sodom, and wash our hands in their blood?" *

* Op. lat., II., 79-108, Weimar ed., VI., 328-348. The detailed account of the proceedings against Luther, promised by Prierias in his *Epitoma*, appeared in a voluminous book with the title: *Errata et argumenta Martini Luteris recitata, detecta, repulsa et copiosissime trita: per Fratrem Silvestrum Prieratem, Magistri sacri palatii* (Romae, 1520), which bore the Papal arms on its title-page and was prefaced by a dedication to Leo X., dated 10th June, 1519. According to a statement on the last page, the printing was completed on the 27th of March, 1520. Besides this original edition there is one known as printed in Florence, in 1521, another of Rome, printed in 1527. Cf. MICHALSKI, 33 seq. The book is also for the most part reprinted in ROCCABERTI, *Bibl. max. Pont.*, tom XIX. (Romae, 1699), 227-336. The work is divided into three books, of which the first two give the scheme of the work and the third an epitome of the contents, verbally identical with the *Epitoma* which preceded it. The advance made in Luther's movement, since he first published his theses, shows how clear Prierias's judgment had been from the beginning, in perceiving that his attack on indulgences was only incidental, and that the real object of his attack was the authority of the Church. He placed this in the foreground as the key-note to all the manifestos of Luther. The first book dealt with the fundamental questions of the Primacy of the Pope, his supreme power of jurisdiction in the Church, his relation to a General Council, and his infallibility in the teaching office; this last point being treated in detail. In the second book, Prierias proceeds to treat of subjects made by Luther into special matters of dispute,

If such writings did not decide Rome's final verdict, they nevertheless afford sufficient proof that their author did not fall unjustly, though too late, under the ban of the Church.*

So far as can be judged by the very defective accounts of the prosecution and termination of Luther's Roman trial, the influence of the Louvain theologians must have been quite equal to that of Eck: though all through its last stage the ruling spirit was Cardinal Giulio de' Medici.† In the Bull *Exsurge*, the draft of which was made by Accolti, forty-one of Luther's articles were grouped by Eck with due regard to the Louvain doctors. These were condemned wholesale without sufficient regard to the distinction of their individual degree of offensiveness. The Bull was, at the end of April, given for consideration to a new commission. On the 2nd of May Eck made his report to the Pope about the final wording of this most important document.‡ He had to seek him in the hunting

going more exhaustively into what he had already dealt with in his *Dialogus*. He gives an ample exposition of the doctrine of indulgences and the questions connected with it, as attacked by Luther; and goes more closely into the four fundamental propositions laid down in the *Dialogus* relating to the authority of the Church and the Pope. Finally, in the form of a lengthy supplement (fol. CCXXI.-CCLXVIII.), Prierias takes up the attacks on the Primacy made by Luther in his latest works, especially in his *Resolutio super propositionem XIII. de potestate Papae*. This polemical masterpiece left Luther no room for further reply.

* BEZOLD (Reformation, 288), referring to the above sanguinary demand for the bloody annihilation of the "Papists," declares "that it is vain to attempt to divest such words of their revolutionary character."

† KALKOFF, Prozess, 133.

‡ According to SARPI (Hist. d. conc. Trid., 1629, 11), whose statements must be, at anyrate, founded on fact, the theologians and canonists were opposed to one another during the discussion. Both

lodge of Magliana, in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome.* Not till then was the Bull submitted to the Sacred College. Four Consistories, held on May 21, 23, 25, and June 1, were necessary to bring the affair to a conclusion.† In the second and third Consistories the only thing settled was the order of the day. The care with which the case was gone into can be seen by the unusual duration of the sittings. Some lasted six, others seven, and some even eight hours.‡

recognized the notoriety of Luther's heresy, but the canonists demanded that, notwithstanding this, he should be summoned to appear in person and have sentence passed on him, while the theologians wished to pass sentence without further preliminaries. The final wording of the Bull was a compromise between these two opinions, by making a distinction between the person and the writings of the accused, and the separate measures which were to be taken against them. "As, concerning the error in doctrine, there was no difference of opinion, in dealing with the writings the will of the theologians was followed; but as regards the personal measures to be taken, the canonists had their way, though not completely, for Luther was not cited to appear; but a term was fixed for his recantation, with the remark that, under the circumstances, sentence could be passed at once. Both parties maintained that the *notorium facti permanentis* or *iudici* existed, as was indicated by the Bull." MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 80; *cf.* SCHULTE, 47 *seq.*, and KALKOFF, 110 *seq.*, where he maintains that, as far as the trial of the case was concerned, the compromise had existed before the sitting of the commission.

* *Cf.* WIEDEMANN, *Eck*, 151, and KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 102, n. 4.

† *Cf.* the entries about it in the *Acta Consistoralia*, in SCHULTE, *loc. cit.*, 33-35. To be found before this, though less completely, in FONTANA, *Theatrum Dominic.*, 30; in LAEMMER, *Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa*, Ratisbonae, 1875, 197 *seq.*, and in BRADY, *Episcopal Succession*, II., Rome, 1876, 261 *seqq.* In SCHULTE, 35 *seqq.*, 376, for the investigations made by the Cardinals taking part in the Consistory, and the experts invited to attend. See, further, the important statements of KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 110 *seqq.*

‡ *Cf.* the Despatch of Paolucci of May 22, in BALAN, VI., 37, n. 2, and the same in the *Letter of May 26 (State Archives, Modena).

On the 20th of May a demand from Leo X., in menacing terms, was sent through Cardinal Riario and Valentin von Teutleben, the agent of the Elector of Saxony, and temporarily serving in that capacity to the Elector of Mayence, to request Frederick of Saxony to compel Luther to recant.* This was an ultimatum which Frederick rejected finally at the end of July, almost in Luther's own words. The Elector demanded the institution of a court of arbitration, to be held in a safe place and to be composed of men of undoubted learning, and in sufficient numbers to test the doctrines which had never yet been refuted.†

On the 21st of May the draft of the Bull, together with the acts of the Leipzig disputation relating to the notoriety of Luther's heresy, were read in Consistory. The question was then put whether, the articles of Luther being explicitly condemned, he should be once more warned to retract his errors within a given term, and in case of a refusal condemned publicly as a heretic, and at the same time his works be forbidden and committed to the flames. Then came the question, proposed by Eck,

According to the "Libro antico di memorie lasciato dal card. Morone," made use of by Pallavicino (I., c. 19), there was a difference of opinion between Accolti and Card. Lorenzo Pucci about drafting the Bull, the latter wishing to claim for himself the right of doing it. The Pope settled the dispute in favour of Accolti. SCHULTE (*Quellen und Forschung*, VI., 45-47) considers this account improbable and worthless, chiefly because Pucci is inaccurately mentioned as Datary, whereas he actually held that office no longer, having been given that of Chief Penitentiary. In his supplements (378) Schulte modifies this opinion and says that "the matter under dispute was possible but not proved." Against him KALKOFF (*Prozess*, III, *seq.*) asserts the possibility of the affair, for the mistake in regard to Pucci's office does not seem to him a sufficient reason to reject the whole account.

* KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 453 *seq.*, 587-593.

† *Ibid.*, 455 *seq.*, 503 *seq.*, 508 *seq.*, 539-596. Cf. 128 *seq.* *Ibid.*, *Forschungen*, 79.

whether Luther's articles be condemned indiscriminately and without specification, or whether, according to the opinion of Cardinal Cajetan, some discrimination be made between those which could be described as simply heretical and those which were scandalous and offensive to pious ears. The Consistory decided that Cardinal Accolti, who was held in much esteem in Rome for his learning, and especially for his knowledge of law,* should consult experts, and decide this fine theological distinction. After the single articles had been put to the vote, the opinion on this subject was communicated to the Cardinals at the next Consistory, at which Cajetan, in spite of his suffering health, appeared. The long duration of the Consistory shows how thorough and searching were the consultations. "It is five in the afternoon," wrote the Este Ambassador, "and the Consistory is still sitting: Luther's affair is under consultation."† The discussion that day was not over until six o'clock. The final resolution passed was the rejection of all Luther's articles as erroneous; while the discussion of the wording of the Bull on the subject was to be discussed at another Consistory.‡ The

* *Cf.* Report of Morone of 1513 and 1514, in the *Miscell. di stor. Ital.*, II., 178, 209. *Cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 295.

† "Siamo ad hore XIX. et ancor è asserato il concistoro et pur stanno sopra questa causa de Luter." Paolucci to the Duke of Ferrara, dat. Rome, 1520, May 23; (*the first letter of that date). *State Archives, Modena*.

‡ *Cf.* Paolucci's second letter to the Duke of Ferrara on May 23, 1520, of which BALAN (VI., 37) gives only a short and insufficient epitome. The text, which confirms KALKOFF'S opinion (*Prozess*, 117), runs thus: "A vinte hore passate è usito el concistoro et intendo che è concluso de li articuli de Martino Lutter siano fatui et heretici et a questaltro concistoro se deliberara la bulla et mandarassi a publicare n Alemagna et vi sera it il monitorio contra quoscunque prestantes auxilium consilium et favorem. Se io potro haver la copia de questi

protocol of the next sitting, which took place on the 25th of May, records only one resolution, namely, that Luther's sentences be quoted verbally in the Bull. The fixing of the various degrees of censure attributable to each sentence fell through, obviously because of the delay it would have caused in terminating the process.*

Prompt action was all the more necessary because it was rumoured that other princes besides the Elector of Saxony were taking Luther's part. Cardinal Accolti, who talked over the situation with the Ambassador of the court of Este, was most anxious about these tidings. He remarked about the Archbishop of Mayence: "We thought he was one of ours; but now we know the contrary. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped that as soon as the Bull is published in Germany, most men will forsake Luther." Cardinal del Monte also had something to say about the part taken by the German princes in favour of Luther; and he expressed a doubt whether even "the greatest of them" were to be trusted. Cardinal Scaramuccia Trivulzio spoke most pessimistically, and said that he doubted whether any good would be effected by the Bull. The Pope also was most anxious; he believed, by what Erasmus said in a letter, that the Bishop of Liège had declared himself in favour of Luther.†

articuli le mandaro. Ogni modo sono pratiche de mala sorte et che potriano causar piu presto declaratione de se che forse non era deliberato." State Archives, Modena.

* KALKOFF, Prozess, 118.

† *Letter of Alfonso Paolucci to the Duke of Ferrara: "Feci l'officio mi commette Vostra Excellentia con monsignor reverendissimo Acoltis et me demostro haverlo molto grato et si raccomanda a Vostra S^{ria} Illustrissima et si offerisse et la prega lo raccomandi a monsignor illustrissimo et reverendissimo, del quale dice esser bon servitore et discorendo con Sua Signoria Reverendissima de questo frate Luter, me dimostrò esser cosa de molto gran momento et fra laltre parole,

It was obvious that under these circumstances it was out of the question to apportion the degree of censure to each proposition. The one thing to be done was to judge them as a whole, with a general reference to individual points. Cardinal Carvajal's description of Luther's appeal to a General Council as "the gravest of all his offences" was entered.*

In the Consistory of the 1st of June, the Bull was read

cavai queste : io non ho pensiero che me possi mancare el vivere etiam honorevole, ma questi altri nostri che non hano ne lettere ni modo, come farano, et resposovi, come seli conviene, vi subiunsi, adunche monsignor reverendissimo la cosa importa più che parole et Sua Signoria è quanto importa et adimandatovi sel sera scoperto altro che Saxonia, mi respose, pensati che vi ne sono de li altri, ma stano coperti et dicendovi come si portava il Magontino, me respose lhavevimo per nostro et hora vedemo el contrario ; è impresa de vna mala sorte, pur si spera come la bulla sia di la, che la maggior parte se removera da l'impresa et pasegiando et acortomi non volea piu oltre procedere." The Ambassador proceeds to report his conversation with Cardinal del Monte : " Parlai con Sua Signoria sopra queste tante fatiche di questi lunghi concistori, me demostro [mag]gior importantia assai et disse et sapiati che in sette o octo hore siamo stati lie, de altro no se parlato, se non di questo frate et disse che li fomenti suoi erano da li grandi de l'Amagna et [de]mostrava dubitare del maggiore. Non parlai molto a longo, perche erano a udire messa." Also, when talking with Cardinal di Como, the conversation turned on the Lutheran affair : " Il prefato cardinale existima chel favore del Luter sia da tuti quelli grandi de Alamagna, se ben non si dimostrano et ni sta ancor lui molto dubioso del successo de la bulla si mandara. Ho inteso hozi avanti el vespero papale che Nostro Signore si è doluto, chel vescovo de Legi presti adiuto a questo frate et lo cava de una epistola de Erasmo che scrive al frate, che lo episcopo de Legi non li mancara. Me pare conoscerli gran confusione in questa impresa : Dio che conosce il bisogno, dispona el meglio. . . . Ex urbe die 26 Maii 1520." The postscript contains this interesting passage : " Monsignor de Flisco sta vn pocho indisposto. Et non fu visto al concistoro che durò sette hore, ne hozi al vespero pa[pale]." State Archives, Modena.

* KALKOFF, Prozess, 120 seq.

once more and its publication resolved upon. By the 15th the preparation of the document was officially completed, and the publication followed soon after. It was known as the Bull *Exsurge Domine* from its first words.*

In the solemn prelude to the Bull, which is for the greater part made up of passages from Scripture, the protection of the Divine Founder of the Church and the Princes of the Apostles is first invoked. "Arise, O God, judge Thine own cause" (Ps. lxxiii. 22). "Catch us the little foxes that destroy the vines" (Cant. ii. 15). "The boar out of the wood hath laid it waste, and a singular wild beast hath devoured it" (Ps. lxxix. 14). Even as Peter had foretold, lying teachers had risen up who had brought in sects of perdition. The whole Church was then appealed to, whose true interpretation of Scripture was set at naught by men whose minds had been blinded by the father of lies and led to falsify the Bible, in contradiction to the interpretation of the Holy Ghost, as was the way with all teachers of error.

Proceeding, the Pope complains that such doctrines should have been spread among the illustrious German nation, which he and his predecessors had always held in special affection. It was well known that among all nations the Germans had ever been most eager to oppose heresy, that they had shed their blood in the war against the Hussites, and even now, through the Universities of Cologne and Louvain, had triumphantly refuted the new errors.

* Printed in Bull. ed. Coquelines, III., 3, 487 *seq.*; Bull. Rom. ed. Taur., V., 748 *seqq.*; Raynaldus, 1520, n. 51 *seqq.* About the earliest manuscript and impressions, see DRUFFEL in the Sitzungsber. der Münchener Akademie, Histor. Klasse, 1880, 572, n. 1, and KALKOFF, Prozess, 129, n. 2. As for the condemnation by the Bull of Luther's thirty-third thesis (the punishment by death of heresiarchs), see HERGENRÖTHER, Staat und Kirche, 556.

After this, forty-one Lutheran errors were enumerated. These relate to free-will and original sin, to the sacraments in general, to faith, grace, sin, penance, confession, good works, purgatory, communion under both kinds, the Primacy, excommunication, the authority of General Councils, the punishment of death for heretics, and the errors of Hus.

As God had confided the chief pastoral office to the Pope, he must provide against the propagation of such errors, and cut them out like a canker. Therefore, by virtue of his supreme authority he now condemns them, partly as heretical, partly as a cause of scandal, partly as false, partly as offensive to the ears of the faithful, partly as seductive to simple souls and contrary to Catholic truth. He forbids, under the severest penalties, that they should be preached by any, whether religious or secular.

The *writings* which contain the above-named errors shall, immediately after the publication of the Bull, be solemnly and publicly burned in every place. In connection with this injunction Luther is expressly alluded to for the first time. Then the Bull turns to his *person* in the following manner:—The preceding course of events is described, and the emphatic declaration is made that the Pope has left nothing undone to recall Luther from his errors. He mentions his invitation to appear in Rome, his discussion with Cajetan, his obstinate disobedience in remaining for more than a year under censure. He is reminded of his appeal—contrary to the stringent prohibition of Pius II. and Julius II.—to a future Council, the authority of which he nevertheless declares to be null. From all this the Pope draws the conclusion that he could no longer proceed against Luther as against one only under suspicion in matters of faith, but must without

further warning declare him to be a heretic. Nevertheless, the Pope will not pronounce sentence of excommunication at once, but, yielding to the counsel of the Cardinals, will allow justice to give way to mercy. Being mindful of the compassion of God who desireth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live, he would forget the injury done to the Holy See, and would proceed with all gentleness, in order that the prodigal son might be brought back to the bosom of the Church. Then he exhorts and adjures Luther, by the mercy of God and the Blood of Christ, no longer to disturb the peace, unity, and truth of the Church for which the Divine Redeemer Himself had so instantly prayed to the Father, and to abjure those errors which had been condemned. A limit of sixty days, after the publication of the Bull, is fixed for his recantation, which is to be made at St. Peter's and the Cancelleria in Rome, as well as in the Cathedrals of Brandenburg, Meissen, and Merseburg. If he did not recant within this time, Luther and his followers, by the evidence of the writings which had been examined, should be cut off "like the withered vine branches which abide not in Christ" (John xv. 6), and declared notorious and obstinate heretics, and condemned to all the penalties to which canon law could condemn them.

Then the Bull returns once more to Luther's writings,* and commands that all books that he has already written and might write in the future, be burned, even if they do not contain the above-mentioned errors.

After the expiration of the term of sixty days, Luther was to be avoided as a heretic by all the faithful; all spiritual and temporal authorities were bound to arrest him and deliver him up in Rome, or else banish him and his followers from their dominions. All the places in

* This passage points to the difference of opinion at the conference.

which he dwelt would be laid under an interdict while he was there and for three days after. Finally, should he not recant within the time fixed, all the clergy, secular and religious, were to declare him a heretic.

There are therefore three divisions to be noted in the Bull. In the first, Luther's errors in faith are unconditionally condemned; in the second, his writings are equally condemned and ordered to be burned as soon as the Bull is published. The author of these false doctrines and writings, who is the subject of the third part, is on the contrary to be allowed time for reflection, and be excommunicated only after the expiration of that time.*

By the Bull *Exsurge* the Pope applied to Luther and his followers the "monitio evangelica" which precedes the sentence of excommunication and gives time to do penance, while at the same time it enables the judge to establish the moment of obstinacy (*pertinacia*) which is essential to constitute the state of heresy.†

* The ordinary name, "Bull of excommunication," is therefore ambiguous and to be avoided. The name "Bull of condemnation," proposed by Kalkoff, and taken from Eck, seems to be badly chosen, as it suggests the idea that Luther himself, as well as his writings, was unconditionally condemned. On the other hand, the name "Bull of excommunication and menace," which has found much favour of late, though it conveys admirably one aspect of the contents, does not sufficiently emphasize the exceptional gravity of the condemnation of Luther's errors and writings. Cf. KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 274, n. 2.

† MÜLLER, *Prozess*, 82. "It cannot be denied," says PLANCK (*Gesch. d. Entstehung unseres protest. Lehrbegriffs*, I., 273), "that the Roman Court, if it wished to remain in other ways true to its principles and interests, had to seize hold of this last means of defending itself against an antagonist so defiant that any show of conciliation was bound to make him bolder. If we wish to be quite impartial, we must admit that as many precautions as possible were taken not to drive him to extremities." Cf. WIEDEMANN, *Eck*, 152: BRISCHAR, *Kontroversen*, I., 51 *seq.*

II.

Briefs of the 17th and 18th of July, 1520, entrusted the publication and execution of the Bull *Exsurge* to the Papal Librarian, Hieronymus Aleander, and the professor of Ingolstadt, Johann Eck, whom the Pope soon made protonotary. Both these learned men were devoted to the Holy See, and gifted with rare intelligence and energy. Nevertheless the Italian was more of a humanist than a theologian, and before he entered the priesthood his morals had not been above reproach.*

Girolamo Aleandro,† or, as he is more commonly called, Aleander, was born at Motta in Friuli in 1480. Even during his studies in Venice he won for himself a name as a distinguished humanist. He also studied theology and canon law, but was more remarkable for his rhetorical gifts. His renown grew when he was called to the University of Paris, where he worked, with only the intermission of half a year, from 1508 till 1513. There he was the real founder of the Greek School, and was the leading professor of Hebrew and Latin during the reign of Louis XII. His brilliant position both as professor and humanist was exchanged in 1514 for a post of confidence with the Prince-Bishop of Liège, Eberhard de la Mark. In 1515 he became his Chancellor; in 1516 he was sent by his master on business to Rome. There the versatile and also

* Cf. OMONT, *Journal autobiogr. d'Aléandre*, Paris, 1896, 42. Aleander had received the tonsure at latest in 1502; see PAULUS in the *Histor. Janro.*, XXIII., 630: he was not ordained priest till 1524. CIAN (*Gior. d. Lett. Ital.*, XXXVII., 157) remarks truly that in spite of his shortcomings Aleander never displayed that wantonness which was characteristic of many prelates of his time. Cf. also L. ROCCO, *Girolamo Aleandro seniore*, Treviso, 1898.

† Cf. the excellent monograph by PAQUIER, *J. Aléandre, 1480-1529*, Paris, 1900.

brilliant diplomatist won the favour of the Pope and his cousin Cardinal Medici, whose service he entered as secretary in 1517. In this capacity he continued to work hard in the interests of his Prince-Bishop, who was very anxious to obtain a Cardinal's hat. Even his appointment in July, 1519, as Librarian to the Vatican made no difference in this respect. He was on very confidential terms with both the Pope and Cardinal Medici, and the esteem in which they held him was proved by the mission on which he was sent to the Emperor.

The other Nuncio, Johann Eck, was also highly gifted. He, like Luther, was the son of a peasant, and was unusually talented. He was absorbed in the most profound scholastic questions, as well as in mystical theology, speculative studies, and the positive science of his day. He was also enthusiastically devoted to humanist studies. As a theologian he was far superior to Aleander. After he became, as it were accidentally, mixed up in the dispute with Luther, he placed all his talents and knowledge at the service of the Church. Wherever he had the chance he fought the innovator and his followers with a truly fiery zeal, though often with too great severity, for he was firmly convinced of the danger of the false doctrines. He fully deserved the honourable name of the "Catholic Achilles," bestowed on him by Cardinal Pole. It is now admitted on all sides that he was the most efficient of all Luther's antagonists.*

The sphere of Eck's activity was limited by Leo X. to the courts of the Bishops of Brandenburg, Meissen, and

* As the monograph of WIEDEMANN (Joh. Eck, Ratisbon, 1865) is no longer sufficient in the light of the research of the present day, the most complete record of the activity of the great Catholic champion belongs to Greving, in the "Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen," published by Pastor. Cf. also JANSSEN-PASTOR, VII., 585 *seqq.*

Merseburg, and the other Bishops and prelates, to those of Duke Frederick of Saxony and the other Electors, of John of Saxony and the princes, barons, and towns of Upper and Lower Germany.*

It made no difference to Luther personally who was commissioned to proclaim the Bull, for since 1519 he had determined to break for ever with the Pope and the Catholic Church. But it was considered by his followers most unfortunate that Eck,† who had come forward as the most inveterate antagonist of the Wittenberg professor, and had drawn down on himself the hatred of the whole party, should, of all men, have been charged with the publication of the Bull. It was, however, a great misfortune for the Catholic cause, that the fact of Eck's share in drawing up the Bull *Exsurge* had become known in Germany. The condemnation conveyed by the Bull did not come on the Germans as a blow struck by the supreme power so much as a sword-thrust from the hand of a passionate enemy.‡

In August, 1520, Eck arrived with the Bull in Germany, where he found that, through the treachery of a Roman official, its contents were already known. It had in fact been printed there before it was published in Rome, and was being held up to the derision of satirists.§ Eck began his work in Saxony,|| showing his intrepidity by plunging

* See DRUFFEL in the Sitzungsberichten der Münch. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Histor. Klasse, 1880, 579-582.

† JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 122, from Pallavicino. According to WIEDEMANN, 153, and HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 139, Eck in this yielded only to obedience.

‡ Cf. PALLAVICINO, I., c. 20.

§ KALKOFF, Prozess, 522 seq.

|| Cf. JOH. BARTH. RIEDERER, Beytrag zu den Reformationsurkunden betreffend die Händel, welche D. Eck bei Publication der päpstlichen Bulle wider den sel. D. Luther im Jahr 1520 erreget hat, Altdorf,

at once into the very centre of the enemy's position. On the 21st of September he had the Bull fixed up at Meissen, on the 25th at Merseburg, and on the 29th at Brandenburg. Eck, as also Aleander, had been given the authority to mention by name some of the principal followers of Luther in his deed of publication; * he therefore inserted those of Carlstadt, Johann Wildenauer (Sylvius) of Eger, Johann Dolzegk von Feldkirch, Willibald Pirkheimer, Lazarus Spengler and Bernhard Adelman von Adelmansfelden.† In his notification of the publica-

1762; DRUFFEL in the Proceedings of the Academy of Science at Munich, *Histor. Klasse*, 1880, 571-597; A. SCHRÖDER in the *Jahrb. des histor. Vereins Dillingen*, 9. Jahrg., 1896, 144-172; RIFFEL, I. 230 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 139 *seq.*; DREWS, Willibald Pirkheimers Stellung zur Reformation, Leipzig, 1887, 59-75; FR. ROTH, Willibald Pirkheimer, Halle, 1887, 39-44; *ibid.*, Augsburgs Reformationsgesc., Munich, 1881, 65-69; F. X. THURNHOFER, Bernhard Adelman von Adelmansfelden, Freiburg i. Br., 1900, 70-78.

* Cf. KALKOFF, *Prozess*, 539.

† The account which Baumgärtner sent from Ingolstadt on Oct. 17th, to the Council of Nuremberg, and repeated in nearly all statements (RIEDERER, 58 *seq.*), says that he had just heard that Eck had special permission to cite certain persons—about twenty-four—to appear before His Holiness within sixty days. This is entirely rejected as untrustworthy by KALKOFF (539), as the wrong conception of the sixty days' term shows that his information was very superficial. In reality the mention of the names was left to the discretion of the Nuncio, though he was warned to exercise foresight and prudence in the matter. KALKOFF (532 *seq.*) defends Eck against the charge of arbitrariness in acting thus. He did not exceed his powers. In calling Eck's mission a mistake, and describing his action against the six disciples of Luther mentioned above, KALKOFF remarks (532 *seq.*): "At that time Eck was quite indispensable to the Curia, and by removing them from the district he might, at anyrate in the case of the majority, have got rid of Luther's most inconvenient defenders." See *ibid.* (534 *seqq.*) for the formalities observed by Eck in his proceedings against these six persons. See

tion of the Bull which he sent to Rome in the beginning of October, he specifies that "the parties concerned should, within the term of sixty days, either justify themselves before the Pope, or else forward to him the proof of their absolution at the hands of the special commissioners ; or else, if they preferred to do so, be themselves the bearers of it. Unless this were done under sixty days, they would fall under the penalties mentioned in the Bull."*

Of the six of Luther's followers thus singled out, Adelman, after talking very boastfully and trying to delay the execution of the Bull, was the first to ask for absolution from Eck, which was granted to him on the 9th of November, and delivered to him in writing on the 15th. His submission was not sincere, for though he succeeded in making a good impression on Eck, he remained a secret partisan of Luther's.† The two Nurembergers, Pirkheimer and Spengler, also came to Eck with the request for absolution.

At Leipzig, where Eck arrived on the 29th of September, he had a foretaste of the difficulties which awaited him. He was personally threatened by the students from Wittenberg, and became the object of unexpected attention on the part of the University, so that the Bull was not executed until February, 1521.‡ Opposition now began in earnest. On the 7th of March, 1521, Luther was able to send the pleasing news to his friend Link that the Bull had been pelted with dirt in Leipzig and torn down. The

the account of these six in RIEDERER, 10-25. It cannot be denied that in his selection of the six he let himself be, at anyrate partially influenced by personal antagonism, especially in the case of Adelman and Pirkheimer.

* KALKOFF, Prozess, 535.

† Cf. THURNHOFER, 71-76 ; SCHRÖDER, *loc. cit.*, 147 *seqq.* ; ROTH, Augsburg Reformationsgesch., 65-68 ; WIEDEMANN, 178.

‡ WIEDEMANN, 153 *seqq.*

same thing occurred at Torgau and Döbeln. At the last place the jeering inscription, "The nest is here but the birds have flown," was added to the Bull.*

From Leipzig, Eck sent the Bull on October 3rd, 1520, to the Rector of the University of Wittenberg, Peter Burkhard: but the University refused to accept it.† That of Erfurt also offered resistance. There was a tumult among the students, and even the theological faculty opposed Eck: the students tore down the Bull and threw it into the Gera.‡ Resistance was also shewn by the University of Vienna, where Eck sent the Bull on the 14th of October. The motive assigned was that they could not accept the document until they knew the pleasure of the Emperor, to whom they therefore wrote on the 10th of December.§ Even after the submission of the theological faculty, the Rector and the other members of the University continued their resistance, and it was only by imperial command (March, 1521||) that the Bull was received. Even the Bishop showed great unwillingness to move.¶ At Ingolstadt, to which University Eck sent the Bull on the 17th of October, its publication on the 29th was met with some resistance.**

Many of the Bishops hung back, either from want of loyalty or from timidity. The Bishop of Meissen published the Bull in January, 1521, and the Bishop of Merseburg on

* DE WETTE, I., 569.

† WIEDEMANN, 156 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 139 *seq.*

‡ WIEDEMANN, 158 *seq.*; KAMPSCHULTE, Univ. Erfurt, II., 37 *seq.*
Cf. FALK in *Der Katholik*, 1891, I., 490.

§ The "Protestatio Universitatis Viennensis" addressed to the Emperor, Dec. 10, 1520, in BALAN, Mon. ref., 11-15. Cf. ASCHBACH, Univ. Wien, II., 121 *seq.*

|| BALAN, *loc. cit.*, 16 *seq.*

¶ Cf. WIEDEMANN, 159-161; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 140 *seq.*

** WIEDEMANN, 161-163.

the 23rd of the same month. In those parts of the Electorate of Saxony where Frederick exercised spiritual jurisdiction, it was not published until April.* In South Germany the Bishop of Eichstätt, Gabriel von Eyb, published the Bull through his Vicar-General ten days after he received it on October 24th, 1520.† The Bishop of Augsburg, Christoph von Stadion,‡ made greater difficulties when he received the summons in October to publish the document. His Chapter was divided into two parties, a small one which adhered to the Bishop, and a large opposition under the influence of the brothers Adelman, who had on their side the Dean of the Chapter, Philip von Rechberg, a helpless and incapable young man. Both parties thought the moment inopportune for the publication of the Bull by the Bishop; but the Adelman faction raised more fundamental difficulties, and did all they could to obtain a delay under the pretext that the Bishop should send for Eck to discuss the subject with him.§ As for the Bishop himself, he was not actuated by any consideration involving principle. "In taking up his position he was moved neither by sympathy with Luther nor by zeal for the purity of the faith. To him the Bull was simply inconvenient for external reasons only, because the possessions of the clergy, their lands and privileges, would be endangered by the seditious proclivities of the populace. The position assumed by him in his difficulty was essentially that of a political materialist."||

* WIEDEMANN, 163 *seq.*

† Cf. THURNHOFFER, *loc. cit.*, 71. The Eichstätt mandate is printed in SCHRÖDER, 166-169.

‡ Cf. the above-quoted treatise of SCHRÖDER, p. 279, n. 2, with the correspondence of the episcopal chancery of Augsburg relating to the publication of the Bull; see also THURNHOFFER, 71 *seqq.*

§ Cf. the Chapter's advice, in SCHRÖDER, *loc. cit.*, 154.

|| SCHRÖDER, 152.

He therefore sent a negative reply to Eck's summons, and consequently received a second, requesting him to proceed at once with the publication of the Bull. He perceived that further delay would have the worst consequences for himself and his see, and would be construed into disobedience to the Pope. He therefore ordered that preparations for the publication should be made at once.* The episcopal mandate of publication is dated the 8th of November;† and directions for the printing of it and the Bull followed on the 12th, and were repeated on the 14th of November.‡ He had waited to receive an answer from Eck, whom he had invited to be present at the publication of the Bull and episcopal mandate. The reply came in the form of a candid letter, written on the 10th of November, in which the Nuncio declined the invitation on the plea that the Bishop, being such a good shepherd, would not like to put forward another in his place when danger was threatened on the part of the wolves.§ The difficulties attending the printing of the Bull and episcopal mandate in Augsburg caused fresh delay. But on the 30th of December, 1520, the Bull was proclaimed in the town of Augsburg, though not throughout the diocese until the beginning of 1521.||

The Bishop of Freising, the palsgrave Philip, after much consideration and with great unwillingness, published the Bull on the 10th of January.¶ The palsgrave John, the

* The commission to the Vicar-General Heinrichmann on Oct. 30, in SCHRÖDER, *loc. cit.*, 157 *seq.*

† *Ibid.*, printed, 166–169.

‡ *Ibid.*, 170 *seq.*

§ *Ibid.*, 169 *seq.*; *cf.* 151.

|| *Ibid.*, 152.

¶ *Cf.* the above-quoted treatise of DRUFFEL (279, n. 2); *ibid.*, 588–597, for the correspondence carried on about this by Philip with various bishops and princes. See SCHRÖDER, 161 *seq.*, for his letter to the Bishop of Augsburg, Nov. 3, 1520.

Administrator of Ratisbon, had the Bull read from the pulpit on the 4th of January, 1521.* The Bishop of Bamberg refused to publish it because it had been sent to him in an irregular way.† In Passau nothing took place for some little time;‡ the Bishop, Ernest, the younger brother of the Duke of Bavaria, was one of those unfortunate men who had entered the ecclesiastical state without a vocation, only for the sake of possessing a principality. It was reported that this prelate was too fond of dabbling in Lutheran doctrines; and it was probably on this account that Eck omitted to send the Bull to him.§

Although the attitude of a man like the Bishop of Passau may not cause surprise, the same cannot be said of the supine behaviour of the Archbishop of Salzburg, Cardinal Lang. Until the beginning of March, 1521, he had made no pronouncement against Luther. He preferred to remain in a state of watchful inactivity, waiting for further developments, wishing neither to force nor hamper events by any decision.|| The same consideration influenced the Dukes of Bavaria, though in their case territorial jealousy played its part. On the 11th of March they sent to the Bishops of the Duchy letters of expostulation, as to the manner in which pastors of souls had acted after the publication of the Pope's Bull of condemnation. By their own experience, they said, as well as by credible reports received, they found that the severity of these in refusing absolution to those who were possessed of Lutheran books, and would not give them up, conduced to sedition and the

* WIEDEMANN, 165.

† *Ibid.*, 165 *seq.*

‡ Stadtholder and councillor to Duke William of Bavaria in the absence of the Bishop, Mar. 18, 1521; DRUFFEL, 593 *seq.*

§ RIEZLER, IV., 61.

|| *Ibid.*, 69.

injury of Christian works, rather than to the salvation of souls and the production of salutary effects. The laity, they added, were opposed to this mode of procedure and were "crying out and murmuring." As the Diet of Worms had undertaken to deal with Luther, the Bishops would do right to direct the clergy to cease their proceedings against Lutheran writings, and neither condemn nor approve, but "let the matter rest" until the result of the examination before the Diet were known. To this the Bishop of Eichstätt replied forcibly that it was not in his power to set aside the command of the Pope.* Such a method of proceeding on the part of the strictly Catholic Dukes of Bavaria, shows how little the importance of the whole affair was realized.

Luther,† who knew himself to be safe under the protection of his own Elector,‡ had at first, like Erasmus, given himself the airs of not believing the Bull to be genuine. He declared that it had been made up by Eck, and as such discredited it in his book: "Eck's New Bull and Lies." When, however, he was no longer able to keep up a semblance of incredulity as to its genuineness, he took a line more violent than ever against the Pope. "Never, from the beginning of the world," he wrote in November 1520, to Spalatin,§ "has Satan spoken so shamelessly against God as in this Bull. It is impossible for anyone who accepts it and does not contest it, to be saved."|| On the 17th of

* RIEZLER, IV., 69.

† Cf. RIFFEL, I., 242 *seqq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 146 *seqq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 124 *seqq.*; WIEDEMANN, 170 *seqq.*

‡ Cf. KALKOFF, Prozess, 543 *seqq.*; KALKOFF, L. Pastors "Leo X." vom Standpunkte der Reformationsgeschichte, in the Archiv für Ref.-Gesch., III., 203.

§ DE WETTE, I., 522; ENDERS, II., 511.

|| "This is a strong expression," says De Wette.

November he again appealed from the Pope, "as from an unjust judge, hardened and erring, and, by all his writings, a convicted heretic and schismatic," to a General Council. He demanded of the Emperor, the Electors, and all princes and sovereigns to join with him in opposing "the unchristian conduct and amazing enormities of the Pope." Whoever, says he, follows the Pope, him did he, Martin Luther, hand over to the Divine tribunal.* At the beginning of November he gave vent to his full fury in an intemperate, passionate pamphlet, "Against the Bull of Antichrist," published both in Latin and German. Starting from his usual premise that his doctrine alone was the truth, he declares that the Bull, which is opposed to this truth, has for its object to compel men to deny God and worship the devil. If the Pope and his Cardinals will not change this, he declares that the Roman See is the seat of Antichrist, he condemns it and hands it over to Satan, with this its Bull and all its Decretals. "What wonder if all princes, nobles, and all the laity should set to and belabour Pope, bishops, priests, and monks, and drive them out of the country?" The Bull deserves that "all good Christians should trample it under foot, and that the Roman Antichrist and his apostle Eck should be driven away with fire and brimstone."† "As a full proof of his defiance," he published‡ another pamphlet in which he defended the condemned sentences, and in places emphasized them.§

* Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 124 ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 146.

† JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 124 *seq.* ; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 146 *seq.* ; PAULUS in the *Histor.-polit. Blättern* CXXXVI., 799 *seq.* ; PERLBACH in the *Sitzungsberichten der Berliner Ak. der Wissenschaften*, 1907.

‡ HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, 147.

§ *Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum.*

On the 10th of December, 1520, Luther went in solemn procession, followed by the students, and burned the Papal Bull together with the books of canon law and several of his adversaries' writings. While doing this he solemnly pronounced the words: "Because thou hast afflicted the saints of the Lord, so may everlasting fire afflict and devour thee!" By this action he expressed, publicly and finally, his breach with the Church. Next day he spoke as follows to his disciples in the College: "This burning is only a trifle. It is necessary that the Pope and the Papal See be also burned. He who does not resist the Papacy with all his heart cannot obtain eternal salvation."* In his treatise, published under the name of "Warumb des Babsts und seiner Jüngern bücher von D. Martin Luther verbrandt sind," he says: "From all time it has been the custom to burn impious books (Acts xix. 19), and as Doctor in Holy Scripture he was bound to suppress bad books; if others from ignorance or human respect neglected to do this, it did not free him from responsibility. His writings had been burned at Cologne and Louvain, which, among the ignorant, had raised suspicion against him; therefore, for the establishment of truth, he had good reason to burn the books of his adversaries, being, as he hoped, prompted thereto by the Holy Ghost."†

The term of grace after the Bull had been affixed at Meissen, Merseburg, and Brandenburg expired on the 27th of November.‡ On the 3rd of January, 1521, excommunication was pronounced on Luther in the Bull *Decet Romanum*

* JANSSEN-PASTOR, II., 18, 127; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 148; FRIEDENSBURG (Quellen und Forschungen, I., 320 *seq.*) publishes an interesting contemporary account of the burning of the Bull.

† HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 148. Cf. RIFFEL, I., 249-252.

‡ K. MÜLLER, Prozess, 82 *seq.*

Pontificem.* This Bull definitely excluded Luther and his followers from the communion of the Church, and at the same time all pretext for maintaining that Luther had not been unconditionally condemned by the Holy See, was removed. With this Bull the Pope sent special Briefs to Cardinal Albert of Mayence, as Inquisitor-General for the whole of Germany, as well as to the Nuncios, Caracciolo, Aleander, and Eck, giving them powers to proceed with energy against all obstinate Lutherans, even were they of electoral dignity, and to reconcile to the Church all who repented. The absolution of Luther, Hutten, Pirkheimer, and Spengler was reserved to the Pope.†

The two last named, "though not without keen personal humiliation," asked for absolution.‡ But Hutten had not the remotest idea of doing such a thing. His rage against Rome had known no bounds ever since the Pope had, in a Brief of July 20, 1520, ordered the Archbishop of Mayence to stop his dangerous operations, and, if necessary, take severe measures against him.§ Hutten published a pamphlet against the Bull, full of the bitterest remarks. In the prelude he called on all Germans to take vengeance on the Pope, on account of the document by which he wished to suppress the budding truth. The

* Bull, V., 761-764. In the first draft of the Bull, besides Luther, Hutten, Pirkheimer, and Spengler were mentioned by name. This original version has not been so far found. There exists in print only the form altered at Aleander's request, in which Luther alone is mentioned by name. Cf. KALKOFF, 135 *seqq.* It must be here pointed out that Aleander did not publish the Bull at Worms, because the highly esteemed Elector of Saxony was too plainly threatened in it.

† BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 8.

‡ Cf. KALKOFF, Pirkheimers und Spenglers Lösung vom Bann, 1521, in the Jahresber. des Gymnasiums St. Maria Magdalena zu Breslau, 1896.

§ BÖCKING, I, 362.

conclusion was in the form of a missive to Leo X., in which he said: "Bounds and limitations must be set to thine audacity, and a curb on such childish, wanton Bulls." *

In his pamphlets, written for the people, and therefore in German, Hutten, trusting to the protection of his powerful friend Franz von Sickingen,† openly incited them to revolt.

"Den Aberglauben tilgen wir,
Die Wahrheit wiederbringen hier,
Und d'weil das nit mag sein in gut,
So mutz es kosten aber Blut." ‡

In face of such an agitation, almost everything depended on the attitude taken by the young Emperor; and Aleander's first efforts were directed towards influencing him.

III.

Aleander's appointment, dated July 17 and 18, as Nuncio-Extraordinary and Ambassador to Charles V. and the other sovereigns of Germany, was to be in conjunction with that of the ordinary Nuncio, Marino Caracciolo,§ already accredited

* STRAUSS, II., 96.

† Cf. SZAMATOLSKI, 62 *seq.*

‡ "All superstition we root out,
Return of truth we bring about;
And if all gentle means prove vain,
We will by blood the vict'ry gain."

§ Marino Caracciolo, a Neapolitan (*cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 599), had been sent to Rome in 1515 by Maximilian Sforza to represent him at the Lateran Council. Leo X. made him Protonotary, and in Feb. 1517 appointed him Nuncio as successor to Campeggio at the court of the Emperor Maximilian; see PAQUIER, 148. The opinion, hitherto accepted, that Caracciolo took up his appointment in the autumn of 1517, must be a mistake (see *supra*, p. 244), for a *Brief of Leo's to the Emperor, dated from Rome on the 6th of March, 1518, gives the first

to the imperial court, and entrusted with carrying out the secular policy of the Holy See, and was to be carried on contemporaneously with the mission of Eck.*

notice of Caracciolo's appointment. I found this document (which, as far as I know, has not been printed) in the Ambrosian Library in the codex spoken of in Appendix, No. 22, Vol. VIII. Caracciolo took part with Cajetan in the Diet of Augsburg. He remained in Germany till the election of Charles V.; see Reichstagsakten, I., 832 *seq.* Caracciolo's appointment as Nuncio to Charles V. followed at the beginning of January 1520. PIEPER (*Ständige Nuntiaturen*, 53) surmises that his entry into office was deferred because of Charles's journey to Germany. This hypothesis is confirmed by a *Letter of Leo's, "Magistro Marino Caracciolo clerico Neapolit. secretario, dat. 1520, tertio Non. Iunii" (3rd of June), in which it is said: "We have sent thee before to Germany, to the Emperor Maximilian; now thou hast returned; but we wish to send thee to Charles V., and therefore renew the faculties which were given to thee then." Regest. 1201, f. 88, Secret Archives of the Vatican (*cf.* PAQUIER, 148, who knows the Brief in a MS. at Bologna; *cf.* DOREZ in *Rev. des Bibl.*, VIII., 236). Caracciolo had his introductory audience with the Emperor at Ghent, accompanied by Raffaello de' Medici, accredited in August, 1519; (*cf.* PIEPER, *loc. cit.*). Caracciolo's despatches from his German legation are most interesting. Unfortunately, but little care has been taken to preserve them. The State Archives, Milan, contain numerous letters and deeds of Caracciolo's, but they belong exclusively to the time of the two last Sforzas, and when he was himself Governor in Milan. In spite of the closest research (1888), I could not find one document referring to his German legation, nor have any better results followed from the later researches (March, 1905) set on foot by the Administration of the Archives. Professor Kalkoff called my attention to the circumstance that Oldoin had published in the *Athenaeum Romanum*, Perugia, 1676, 483, a copy of the letter of Cardinal M. Caracciolo of 1574; unfortunately, thorough investigations, set on foot with regard to this literary rarity have, up to this time, remained without result.

* BALAN, Mon. ref., n. 3. *Cf.* KALKOFF, *Forschungen*, 76. Aleander's despatches, which were formerly known in an incomplete form through MÜNTER (1789-1798) and FRIEDRICH (1870), were edited in 1883 by BALAN (Mon. ref. Luther) and almost simultaneously by BRIEGER (*Aleander und Luther*, I., 1884). The latter first issued a

The instructions received by Aleander warned him to work in harmony with Eck,* and provided for the event of Luther or any of his followers demanding a hearing of the Emperor. In answer to any such demand it was laid down that, Luther's doctrine having been condemned by the Holy See, any appeal elsewhere could not be allowed. But if Luther wished to appeal to Rome, a safe-conduct would be granted, and a gracious hearing vouchsafed.

The further purport of the instructions shows how little the possibility of such an event was expected. Aleander was directed to petition, first the Emperor, and after him all the princes, to arrest Luther at the expiration of the term of grace, and deliver him up to Rome to be punished, and to proceed with severity against his followers. All the Bishops were to be exhorted to proceed against them in accordance with the Bull of the Lateran Council, directed against all who printed wicked and heretical books.

The appointment of a second Nuncio in connection with the Lutheran affair shows the importance attached to it by the Pope.† There was more than a remote possibility that jealousies might arise and disturb the harmonious proceedings of the two Nuncios. Indeed, there was no

good chronology and critical text; in the appendix the noteworthy readings of Balan are utilized. Cf. BRIEGER'S important revisions of Balan in the *Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1884, 17 *seqq.* Two interesting letters of Aleander's from Aix are published by BELLESHEIM in the *Zeitschr. des Aachener Geschichtsvereins*, XIX., 2, 117 *seq.* Kalkoff's translation, 2nd ed., 1897, affords a valuable and profound objective explanation. The work of HAUSRATH on Aleander and Luther at Worms (Berlin, 1897), written strongly on the Protestant side, must be rejected as insufficient (KALKOFF in the *Deutsch. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1898, No. 6; Zarncke's *Zentralblatt*, 1898, 286 *seq.*; cf. M. LEHMANN in the *Nachr. der Gött. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.*, 1899, 165 *seq.*).

* BALAN, *Mon. ref.*, n. 4.

† See BRIEGER in the *Theol. Literaturztg.*, 1844, 478 *seq.*

lack of jealousy, and the Pope had to send frequent admonitions to the Nuncios to work in harmony.*

As Aleander's time was still claimed by his private business,† his departure, much to the annoyance of the impatient Pope, was deferred till the 27th of July; even then he had to keep a previous engagement in France with Francis I.‡ and it was not until the 22nd of September that he arrived at Cologne, and not until the 25th at Antwerp. To his joyful surprise the Emperor declared that he was willing to lay down his life in defence of the Church. Consistently with this declaration, he showed the greatest readiness to put the Papal Bull into execution in the Netherlands promptly and loyally. Immediately afterwards an imperial edict was issued commanding the burning of the heretical books. Aleander, looking on everything as so far settled, went on to Louvain on the 8th of October and to Liège on the 17th.§

Next to the sermons which, by his instructions, he was bound to preach in all parts, Aleander considered the public burning of the heretical books as the best means of checking the propagation of false doctrine. By this means the Papal condemnation of the heresy became more surely proclaimed than was possible by the delivery of the Bull to the Bishops. Besides, the execution in this manner of the sentence pronounced by the authority of the Pope, made

* Cf. the letter of March 3 in BALAN, n. 33. See also KALKOFF, Aleander, 138.

† Cf. KALKOFF, Forschungen, 78.

‡ PAQUIER, 150-151.

§ See the report of Aleander sent to Leo X., in Quellen und Forschungen, I., 151 *seq.*, and Reichstagsakten, II., 454 *seq.* Cf. 499, n. 2, and PAQUIER, 151-152; KALKOFF in Archiv für Ref.-Gesch., I., 282 *seq.*, and, Anfänge der Gegenreformation, I., 19 *seq.*, 110 *seq.*

a deep impression on the infected laity. Finally, the Lutherans feared nothing more.*

At Aix, where Aleander attended Charles's coronation, he, in company with Caracciolo, visited Cardinal Albert of Mayence, who had equally declared himself against Luther and Hutten. The Electors of Cologne and Treves† showed the same readiness to obey the Pope. Aleander was very favourably impressed by the Elector Frederick of Saxony. "The Elector," he wrote, "seems to be naturally right-minded. He is very pious, but his counsellors are nearly all as Lutheran as Luther himself. On the 4th of November Caracciolo and I visited him, and were at such great pains in arguing with him, that he appeared to be more or less convinced, and declared to us that he had not exchanged more than twenty words with Luther."‡

But Aleander was greatly deceived as to the real opinions of the Elector, for he was in reality wholly on the side of Luther, and tried with the utmost ingenuity to interpret the laws of the Empire in favour of his protégé. On the 31st of October he went to Cologne to remonstrate with the Emperor in person about the condemnation without appeal of the professor of Wittenberg. To this Charles replied that Luther would have the benefit of the law as occasion offered.§

On the 6th of November Frederick rejected the alternatives, offered by the Papal Nuncios, of either imprisoning or delivering Luther up, and burning his writings at once. before he had been examined by learned and impartial judges and convinced of his error. If he were thus really

* KALKOFF, Aleander, 30-31.

† Reichstagsakten, II., 457 *seq.*, 583 *seq.*

‡ *Ibid.*, 461.

§ KALKOFF, Prozess, 548 *seq.*, 583 *seq.*

convicted, the Elector was willing to do everything that befitted an obedient son of the Catholic Church.*

This scheme of submitting the case to the so-called arbitration of certain learned men was equivalent to saving Luther's cause, and to bringing about the suspension, or rather the recall, of the Bull *Exsurge*. This was advocated, conjointly with the Elector of Saxony, by no less a personage than Erasmus.† The project was worthy of the temporizing disposition and vague theology of the highly-gifted scholar. The deep-seated nature of the dispute made such a plan futile. Moreover, the withdrawal of the Bull would have been against the first principles of the Catholic Church; so also would a dispute about matters of faith, submitted to private arbitration, have been a defiance of ecclesiastical authority, which could alone be appealed to. What good could a court of arbitration do, which, as Luther wished, would ask the Church to break with all past traditions concerning her most vital doctrines, her sacraments and institutions? There could be no question of any such understanding or compromise; and this Erasmus's vague theology quite ignored.

He believed so fully in the realization of his ideal that he used all his influence to promote it, and tried to sweep away all that was opposed to it, making use of even the most reprehensible means, "the moral overthrow of Aleander and false representations of his methods."

* Reichstagsakten, II., 462 *seq.*

† For what follows, *cf.* the very interesting and important treatise of KALKOFF'S, *Die Vermittlungspolitik des Erasmus und seine Anteil an den Flugschriften der ersten Reformationszeit*, in the *Archiv für Ref.-Gesch.*, I., 1-83, *cf.* 194; see also *Repertorium für Kunstwissens.*, XXVII., 358 *seq.*; KALKOFF in the *Zeits. für Gesch. des Oberrheins*, XXI., 267.

While Erasmus was casting slurs on Aleander as a false Nuncio and a deceiving Jew, he threw doubts, against his better knowledge, on the validity of the Bull *Exsurge*. He declared that such a document was quite irreconcilable with the known gentleness of Leo's character, and must therefore have been fabricated, not even in Rome, but by the extremists of Cologne and Louvain. With the greatest success he spread his views as to its invalidity among the people, working for that end not only by private letters and conversation, but also by a craftily-worded anonymous publication, and by contributions to the biting pamphlets of Hermann van dem Busche, in which Aleander was threatened with death. Every method, even the most reprehensible, seemed permissible to Erasmus, if only it would enable him to sweep from the face of the earth this Bull, which was so dangerous to his plans.

Although he worked mostly in the dark, his schemes did not escape the vigilance of the Papal Nuncio. Late in the autumn he called to account the man who had tried by such underhand means to bring his mission to naught. More than once he expressed his regret to Erasmus at finding that he was the author of the widespread belief that the Bull was either a forgery or fraudulently compiled. Erasmus was compelled to accept the testimony produced by Aleander, and the Nuncio rejected all his excuses so emphatically that the versatile scholar reddened, and stammered "in mortal confusion."

It appears that, even after the Elector of Saxony showed his hand on the 6th of November, Aleander still believed that he would be able to win him over; for at that time the Nuncio was under a fatal delusion as to the importance of the Lutheran revolt. Even when at Cologne, he said

that "he had no slight hopes of victory." * He came face to face with resistance for the first time when, in spite of the strong protest of Erasmus, he ordered a general destruction of Lutheran writings at Mayence.† The people protested loudly, and those charged with the burning hesitated. Aleander himself was nearly subjected to violent treatment, and it was only by threats that he carried out his purpose. Before he left the city, he gave directions to the Provincial of the German Dominicans to preach against Luther throughout his province.‡ As the Papal mission proceeded on its way it was much harassed by Hutten's threats.

At Worms, where he arrived on the 30th of November, Aleander passed through still more bitter experiences. Here all his most sanguine hopes were so completely crushed that he fell into the opposite extreme and judged matters perhaps too despondently. "A legion of armed nobles," he wrote from Worms in the middle of December, "under the leadership of Hutten, were thirsting for the blood of the clergy, and were only waiting their opportunity to break into revolt. The German jurists, both spiritual and secular, were declared Lutherans; still worse, the whole tribe of grammarians and poets maintained that none could have any pretensions to learning, especially in the matter of Greek, unless they renounced the teaching of the Church. He had to suffer the most bitter defamation and calumny from Luther's followers, Reuchlin and Erasmus; there was a report going about that Hutten

* "Non male sperem." At first Aleander had said: "Non desperem." Letter of Nov. 6, 1520, in the Reichstagsakten, II., 460.

† This was done also at Cologne on Nov. 12, and later by Antonio Casulano at Treves; see KALKOFF, Aleander, 26, n. 1.

‡ Letter of Dec. 14, BALAN, n. 11; BRIEGER, n. 1; KALKOFF, Aleander, 29-30.

and his friends desired his blood ; the clergy, with the exception of the parish priests, were infected by the false doctrines, and those who had received preferment from Rome were the worst of all : everywhere the people were carried away blindly by what they heard."

Aleander placed all his hopes in the Emperor, for, as he wrote to Cardinal de' Medici, there had not been, perhaps for the last thousand years, a prince raised up with better dispositions.* His horror was all the greater at learning that Charles V. had yielded to the Elector of Saxony's representations and consented to give Luther a hearing. During Aleander's absence on the 28th of November, the Emperor had written to the Elector Frederick, telling him to bring Luther with him to the Diet of Worms, so that he might be there examined by learned and well-informed persons.† Aleander at once foresaw the full consequences of this step, and did not hesitate to make energetic remonstrances, in which his theological knowledge and his acquaintance with Luther's writings stood him in good stead. The contention of the imperial party, that a German subject could not be legally condemned without a previous hearing, was set aside by him as of no value. There could be no question, he maintained, of a sentence having been passed without a hearing, for Luther's writings spoke only too plainly for themselves ; and matters of false doctrine had always been dealt with in this way. The supreme authority of the Pope overrode any other ; on it, according to St. Jerome, depended the safety of the Church, which otherwise would be torn into as many shreds as there were priests. Aleander explained to the Emperor and his counsellors how, according to the most

* Letter undated, about the middle of December, in BALAN, n. 12 ; BRIEGER, n. 2 ; KALKOFF, 37, 44 *seq.*

† Reichstagsakten, II., 466-468.

elementary ecclesiastical principles relating to the authority of the Pope, it was not practicable to give another hearing to an open heretic who had been legally condemned by the Holy See, and had refused to retract; it was therefore inadmissible to revive before the Diet, which has no special qualifications for dealing with such matters, a case on which the Pope as the true judge had already pronounced a sentence of condemnation. A further aspect of the affair was that Luther had refused to be judged by any who did not agree with him.*

Aleander's arguments did not fail to produce an effect, especially on the Catholic-minded Emperor. Meanwhile the report was spread, presumably through the instrumentality of Eck, that the term of grace of sixty days fixed in the Papal Bull had expired, and that with this Luther's excommunication had become a fact; that the places in which he set foot had fallen under an interdict, and that any holding intercourse with him were excommunicate. Hearing this, on December 17th, Charles V. revoked his invitation of the 28th of November, and told the Elector that only in the event of Luther's recantation could he be admitted to the neighbourhood of Worms.†

This first success on the part of Aleander was soon followed by a second. At his request, the general Council of State determined (Dec. 29) to issue a mandate against Luther applicable to all his followers,‡ to be extended all over the Empire, and to be obeyed under pain of imperial

* Report of Dec. 4, BALAN, n. 11; BRIEGER, n. 1; KALKOFF, Aleander, 33 *seq.* Cf. the Letter of Dec. 17 to Card. Pucci, BRIEGER, n. 3; KALKOFF, 51 *seq.*

† Reichstagsakten, II., 468-470.

‡ Aleander, whose despatches of January are not to be found, mentions the resolution of the State Council (*cf.* KALKOFF, Aleander, 15-16) twice later in his reports on Feb. 8 and 27; see BRIEGER, 49, 75.

attainder. It was, moreover, directed that a special deputation should be sent to the Elector of Saxony, requesting him, in the name of the Emperor, to take proceedings against Luther. These instructions were drawn up by Aleander.*

The deputation to the Elector was, however, deferred, as that prince was already on his way to Worms, where the Diet was opened on the 27th of January, 1521. The situation was thereby changed for the worse as regarded Aleander; for the political considerations which weighed with the States, prevailed more and more in the imperial counsels. They believed that the anti-Papal feeling, which was growing daily in Germany, could only be met slowly and prudently. The Elector Frederick knew how to take advantage of this for the benefit of his protégé. In a letter of the 8th of February, 1521, Aleander described this change in the situation, and the difficulties which now stood in the way of carrying out the imperial edict against Luther. All Germany was in a state of religious sedition, and nine-tenths of the people were adherents of Luther, while the remainder held the Roman Court in deadly hatred. All were crying out for a General Council, which would help to remove the grievances imposed by the Curia. The most powerful princes favoured this movement; the Emperor alone was staunch to the right side. Aleander then went on to relate how Charles had torn in pieces and thrown on the ground a letter from Luther demanding to have "impartial judges."† The Emperor had taken a personal part in drawing up the imperial edict against Luther, the first draft of which was, after "unbearably fatiguing"

* For the text of the instruction, see BALAN, n. 35; as to the time, see WREDE in the Reichstagsakten, II., 474, n. 1; for its significance, see PAQUIER, 177-180.

† Report of Feb. 8, 1521, BALAN, n. 36; BRIEGER, n. 6; KALKOFF, 69 *seq.*

discussion, finally agreed to in the beginning of February. This draft simply demanded the carrying out of the Pope's Bull, while Luther was refused a hearing.* Aleander hoped to obtain a speedy publication of this edict by the authority of the Emperor, but the Chancellor, Gattinara, and other influential counsellors, declared that such an important question must be submitted to the States.

On the 12th of February Aleander handed to the Emperor the Bull of the 3rd of January, which declared the term fixed for Luther's submission to have expired, and consequently pronounced excommunication on him. At the same time a Papal Brief requested the Emperor to issue an edict which would secure the execution of the Pope's sentence.† Charles V. explained that it was the opinion of his Council that the States must not be ignored in a matter of such importance. But in order to incline them to accept the edict, he charged Aleander to appear at the Diet next morning and put forward the Papal demands without any reserve.‡

On the 13th of February, when Charles V. and all the States, with the exception of the Elector of Saxony, were assembled, the Abbot of Fulda read out the message of the Pope to the Emperor, requesting him, as Protector of the Church, to put into execution, by a public edict, the sentence passed on Luther by the Holy See. Aleander then rose to confirm this request, "which put into words the only possible conclusion that the Pope could have arrived at." § Luther, he declared, was endeavouring, as

* Cf. Reichstagsakten, II., 507 *seq.*, 789; WREDE, in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XX., 546 *seq.*, for an earlier draft of Dec. 29, 1520.

† See the Brief in BALAN, n. 13. As to the Bull, see *supra*, 414 *seq.*

‡ See Aleander's report of Feb. 12, 1521, BALAN, n. 21; BRIEGER, n. 7.

§ M. LEYMAN, notice in the *Gött. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.*, 1899, 170.

the Bohemians had done before, to overthrow, in the name of the Gospel, both the ecclesiastical and secular governments in Germany. He had gone so far in writing as to exhort his readers to wash their hands in the blood of the clergy; the Pope and the Universities of Cologne and Louvain had condemned his errors. He showed how numerous and terrible these were by quoting several strongly-worded passages; he also proved that Luther appealed without sanction to Holy Scripture in favour of his doctrines. The Nuncio contested, on solid grounds, the opinion of those who wished Luther to have a hearing at Worms. "All-gracious Emperor," he cried, "how can a man be heard who has openly declared that he refuses to be taught by any, not even by an angel from heaven; and that he desires nothing better than excommunication? Luther has appealed from the decision of the Apostolic See to a General Council; yet he says publicly that Hus was unjustly condemned at Constance. Therefore I ask to know by whom he can be heard and judged."*

Aleander's speech before the Diet is a masterpiece. He spoke for several hours, quickly, fluently, with Italian vivacity, and altogether most ably, and with complete control of his subject. The impression produced by it was the more permanent because many who heard it had not been

* The exact text of Aleander's great speech at the Diet is not before us; and in his letters he gives only a short summary of it (BALAN, n. 22; BRIEGER, n. 8), so that for essentials we have to depend on the report of the Saxon Chancellor, Brück, which is in all its chief points based on a fairly accurate comment by the Saxon secretary. The best copy is in the Reichstagsakten, II., 494-507. PALLAVICINO (I., 25) gives the speech from Aleander's letters, the epitome of his addresses to the Elector of Saxony, and the instructions mentioned above on p. 427. This has been erroneously taken by LE PLAT (II., 83 *seqq.*) for the authentic text.

aware before how entirely Luther had given up the most fundamental doctrines of the Church.*

Aleander pursued his advantage with great vigour. During the lengthy and excited discussion which followed—in the course of which the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg nearly came to blows—he, zealously backed up by Caracciolo, did all he could to carry the point that Luther should be refused a hearing at Worms. His adversaries were, however, quite as zealous and active as he. “Were not the Emperor so well-disposed,” he wrote, “we must have lost the day. The Chancellor, Gattinara, considers it quite hopeless to fight the heresy without a Council. Charles’s confessor, Glapion, dreads a general conflagration; the princes are full of indecision, and the prelates full of fear. Everything is in such a state of confusion that, unless God help us, the wisdom of men will be of no avail.”†

The situation was further confused by the action of the strongly Catholic Duke George of Saxony, who brought forward the question of the German grievances against the Roman government of the Church. He did this with the best intentions, thinking thus to obtain a freer hand to defend the greater interests of the Church connected with faith. The Emperor, however, dissuaded him from mixing up the Lutheran affair, which concerned faith, with grievances and abuses, for the redress of which he undertook to approach the Pope.‡

Meanwhile, to Aleander’s great vexation, Charles’s

* PAQUIER, 203.

† Letters of Feb. 27 and 28, BALAN, n. 31, 32; BRIEGER, n. 11 and 12; KALKOFF, Aleander, 101 *seq.*

‡ The gravamina of Worms did not come within the scope of the project; see Reichstagsakten, II., 662.

counsellors advised him to temporize.* They represented to the Emperor that, on account of the political complications with the States, the greatest possible caution was necessary in regard to this question. They convinced the Emperor that he must use consideration in the matter.

With regard to the excited state of public opinion, the States, on the 19th of February, rejected the severe edict by which Luther was condemned unheard. In place of this they suggested that he should be provided with a safe-conduct and summoned to appear before the Diet. He was, it is true, to be asked whether he would retract his doctrines, as being opposed to the Holy Catholic Faith: if he consented, he was to be given a hearing and fairly met on other points, namely, the grievances connected with the abuses of the Roman Court. If, on the contrary, he refused to retract his errors, the Emperor would at once issue, throughout the Empire, an edict against him as a heretic.†

Charles V. consented to this proposal on the 2nd of March; at the same time he stated in writing that he would be ready to take counsel with the States, in a friendly and gracious spirit, about the Roman grievances and abuses, and discuss the means of their redress. The draft of an edict was appended to this answer, by which Luther was required to make a retraction, and in case of refusal, be subjected to severe measures. In the meantime his writings were to be everywhere destroyed.‡

* Cf. the Letter of March 4, in BALAN, n. 41; BRIEGER n. 13; KALKOFF, 112. The opinion expressed in the Letter of March 8, that Charles's counsellors wished to make political use of Luther's case, is false. KALKOFF, 115, n. 1

† Reichstagsakten, II., 514-517. Cf. LEHMANN in the notices in the Gött. Gesellsch. der Wissensch., 1899, 170 *seq.*, and PAQUIER, 206.

‡ Reichstagsakten, II., 518 *seqq.*

On the 6th of March the States rejected the draft of this edict, and, consequently, the Emperor, on the same day, gave a safe-conduct to Luther. "God grant," said Aleander in a spirit of resignation, "that his coming before the Diet may bring peace to the Church." After an attempt to put the responsibility of Luther's summons on the Elector of Saxony's shoulders, frustrated by Frederick's repudiation of any such thing, the Emperor issued the citation himself.* He, however, expressed his personal views in an edict issued on the 26th of March,† by which the confiscation of all Lutheran writings was commanded on his own authority, without further consultation with the States.

Thereupon Ulrich von Hutten sent a threatening letter to the Emperor, containing a warning against the Romans, as well as abusive invective against all the princes of the Church who were taking part in the Diet. Still more bitter were his letters, full of slanders and threats, to the Papal Nuncios, Aleander and Caracciolo, whom he styled the most reprobate of deceivers, and the most violent of robbers. He threatened Aleander personally, and said he would do all he could to see him annihilated.‡ The Nuncios thereupon begged for the protection of the Emperor against any attempt on their lives, which would have been a transgression of international law. But Charles himself was not surrounded by armed men. As he was still making use of Sickingen's services, he could not call Hutten to account, but was rather inclined to purchase his silence by an income of four hundred gulden. On the 8th of April Hutten sent an apology to the Emperor, in which,

* Reichstagsakten, II., 451, 526-529; cf. KALKOFF, 118.

† Dated March 10; see Reichstagsakten, II., 529-533; cf. 451. See also KALKOFF, 141 *seq.*, and LEHMANN, *loc. cit.*, 1899, 172.

‡ BOECKING, I., 72* *seq.*; II., 12-46. Cf. STRAUSS, II., 171 *seq.*; SZAMATOLSKI, 100 *seq.*

nevertheless, he made a violent attack on the Nuncio. "We cannot," wrote Aleander on the 15th of April, "make it sufficiently clear to the imperialists, in a friendly way, how shameful it is to tolerate such proceedings, and not to concede to us means of redress. They only shrug their shoulders and lament that, under present conditions, they are unable to act otherwise through lack of soldiers. In truth Sickingen is now the only sovereign in Germany; the other princes fold their hands, the prelates tremble and let themselves be snared like rabbits, while the whole world is crying death to the priests."*

On the 16th of April the "arch-heretic," as Aleander styled Luther, arrived at Worms. On the following day the first examination took place before the Emperor and the Diet. Luther admitted that he had written the books which were produced, and which Aleander had procured. To the other questions put to him by the Treves official, Johann von der Ecken, as to whether he would retract the false doctrines contained in them, he replied "in such a low voice that even those close to him could scarcely hear," and requested more time for consideration. This was granted to him, but only until the following day. Next day he boldly defended his writings in a long speech delivered in Latin and German. In it he inveighed against the tyranny of the Pope, and called Rome the flaying-ground of Christendom. In a skilful reply the Treves official pointed out that nearly all Luther's doctrines had been already

* Letter of April 15, BALAN, n. 62; BRIEGER, n. 20; KALKOFF, 156 *seq.* About the imperialists' negotiations with Hutten at Ebernburg, see WREDE in Reichstagsakten, II., 557, n. 3; *cf.* PAQUIER, 231 *seq.* Hutten's action against the Nuncio put Leo X. into such a state of excitement that he threatened extraordinary measures against him, even the extreme one of an interdict; see Letter of Medici, April 29, in BALAN, n. 77.

condemned by the Council of Constance. "Martin," he cried to him, "follow the dictates of your conscience, as you are bound to do; then will you certainly and unhesitatingly retract your errors. You will not be able to prove to me that Councils have erred in matters of faith." But Luther positively refused to retract anything, unless he were first convinced of his error by the Holy Ghost or by plain reason, for, said he, Popes as well as Councils have often erred and have contradicted each other.*

Aleander did not sit as the Pope's representative during Luther's examination, although he continued to work actively in the interests of the Church. He had with much skill made out the scheme of the examination, had inspired the questions to be put to Luther, and the answers to be given by the Treves official, and had checked the tendency to dispute.† Before long he was to find out that his representations to the Emperor had fallen on fruitful soil. On the very next day, April 19, Charles made a declaration, written by himself and spoken in French, that he was ready to lay down his life and crown for the maintenance of the religion of his fathers, and for the extirpation of the heresy so obstinately held to by this erring monk, in opposition to the whole of Christendom; and he regretted that he had not sooner taken measures to repress it. The safe-conduct given to Luther should be respected, nevertheless he could not be allowed to sow sedition among the people. As to

* Aleander made a report about Luther's first hearing on the 17th of April (BALAN, n. 67; BRIEGER, n. 23), and both Nuncios about the second on the 19th of April (BALAN, n. 70; BRIEGER, n. 24). WREDE, in his *Reichstagsakten*, II., 452, gives a good summary and criticism of all available sources about Luther's attitude at Worms; *cf.* PAQUIER, 256. See also KALKOFF, Aleander, 169 *seq.*, 176; and by the same, *Briefe über Luther in Worms*, Halle, 1898.

† PAQUIER, 230, 235, 237.

what further proceedings he could take against Luther as a convicted heretic, he must wait for the States to express an opinion consistent with their duty as Christians, and in accordance with the promise made by them on the 19th of February.*

After this vigorous address of the Emperor's, the sanguine Aleander believed that the victory was gained. But in the night Luther's followers fixed up a manifesto on the door of the Council-chamber, in which they threatened to pass on the word to the seditious peasants. The Archbishop of Mayence was seized with such terror that he begged the Emperor and princes to reopen negotiations with Luther. Charles made merry over his cowardice; but the majority of the States were so intimidated that they besought the Emperor to consent to Luther's being called before a small commission of learned men, who would inform him as to the articles in which he had erred.† Charles once more yielded, in regard to the dispute going on between the supreme court and the imperial chamber. But all attempts to induce Luther to recant were of no avail. "He can be convinced neither by persuasion nor argument," Aleander said in his report to Rome, "for he will accept no judge and rejects all Councils, considering nothing valid except the words of the Bible interpreted by himself, for he rejects all other interpretations as inadequate."‡

The Nuncios once more breathed freely when, all discussions having been broken off, Charles compelled Luther to leave Worms on the 26th of April.§ This state of affairs

* The French text, hitherto known only in a translation, is now printed in *Reichstagsakten*, II., 594-599; *cf.* 855.

† *Reichstagsakten*, II., 599; PAQUIER, 239-240.

‡ Letter of April 27, BALAN, n. 74; BRIEGER, n. 25; KALKOFF, Aleander, 188. *Cf.* PAQUIER, 240 *seq.*

§ PAQUIER, 242 *seq.* This gives a proof that Aleander made no

had been provided for in the declaration of the States on the 19th of February and the 20th of April.* By Luther's refusal to recant, the Emperor was set free to issue an imperial edict in defence of the Catholic Faith, on his own authority. By the desire of Charles, Aleander drew up this important deed on May the 1st. The Nuncio worked all night, and was able to submit his draft on the following morning; though it was then submitted to, and revised by, the imperial council. On the 8th of May he obtained an order through the imperial cabinet for the immediate preparation of the edict. However, when the document was brought to him for signature, Charles declared that it must be first made known to the States. Aleander and Caracciolo were at first equally alarmed by this, but they soon perceived that this precaution was solely in order not to exasperate certain princes inclined to Lutheranism, and thus avoid injury to the proposals contained in the edict.†

The surmise was correct. In spite of all the pressure put on him by the Nuncios, the Emperor, from reasons of political prudence, refused to act until his demands had been passed by the Diet. Aleander meanwhile worked in every possible way, in conjunction with Caracciolo, to promote the issue of the edict by the States, in accordance with the Emperor's repeated promises.‡ Charles kept his word. On the 25th of May he had his edict solemnly read in the presence of a number of Electors and princes, after attempt to obtain the violation of Luther's safe-conduct. The story is equally contradicted that he demanded of the Archbishop of Treves to break the seal of confession.

* Reichstagsakten, II., 599.

† See Aleander's reports of May 5, 8, and 15 in BALAN, n. 80, 89, 95; BRIEGER, n. 27, 29, 31; KALKOFF, Aleander, 205 *seq.*, 214 *seq.*, 230 *seq.*; PAQUIER, 252 *seq.*

‡ See Aleander's report of May 18 in BALAN, n. 93; BRIEGER, n. 32; KALKOFF, 241.

which Joachim of Brandenburg declared that it was accepted unanimously. The States also accepted it with equal unanimity. All ambiguity had vanished. Even though all the States were not present at the reading, the validity of the edict was not affected. The reading before the States, and still more its discussion, were unnecessary, for, in accordance with the resolution passed by the Diet on the 19th of February, the Emperor was entitled, in the event of Luther's refusing to recant, to issue just such an edict, assuming it to have been passed by the States.*

The news that the edict had been passed by the Diet caused great joy among Luther's enemies, and great confusion among his followers. Aleander did not close his eyes all night, partly from the effects of joyful excitement, partly from fear of counter-intrigues. He did not feel secure until the Emperor had signed the document on the 12th of May. "Blessed be the Most Holy Trinity," wrote the Nuncio to Rome, "on whose Feast the greatest means of overcoming the evil, which human reason can conceive, has been given to us. The converting of hearts, and setting men in the right way, belongs to God alone. He will not forsake us."†

The imperial mandate, which is known to the world as

* Cf. PAQUIER, 269-270, against Wrede and Hausrath. Cf. KALKOFF, who maintains that the unanimous acceptance of the edict could be formally supported by the resolution passed by the Diet on the 19th of February (248). However strongly he may speak of "the seditious carrying through of the edict," Kalkoff does not consider that it was "unconstitutional" (249).

† Letters of May 26, BALAN, n. 97; BRIEGER, n. 33; KALKOFF, 244 *seq.* In spite of the edict having been signed on the 26th of May, the date of May 8 remained, as that on which it was approved by the Emperor. That there was no falsification or malice in this is shewn, as says Ranke, by BRIEGER in the *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, IX., 132 *seq.*, by the almost general consent Cf. *Reichstagsakten*, II., 658, n. 1.

the Edict of Worms,* condemned Luther in the severest terms, and placed him under the ban of the Empire, with the command that all his writings be destroyed. The edict declared that he disseminated evil fruits; that he violated the number, rite, and use of the sacraments; that he defiled the inviolable bond of matrimony; that he uttered shameful calumnies against the Pope, despised the priesthood, and incited the laity to wash their hands in the blood of priests. He taught that man had no free-will, and encouraged a life without law, as he had proved by destroying all its hallowed safeguards and burning the books of canon law. He drew contempt on all Councils, especially that of Constance, which had, to its everlasting honour, restored peace and unity to the German nation, calling it the "synagogue of Satan," and all those who took part in it "antichrists and murderers." "Like the spirit of evil in a monk's habit," he united in himself heresies new and old; under a semblance of preaching the faith, he tried to destroy the one true faith; and under pretence of preaching the Gospel, he destroyed all evangelical peace, love, and order.

On the 29th of May Aleander witnessed the carrying out of the imperial instructions at Worms, by the arrangements made there for burning all Luther's writings. Two days later he and Caracciolo, in obedience to instructions received from Rome, went down the Rhine to Cologne in the Emperor's suite.†

Aleander's activity did not cease yet, and he showed the utmost zeal in carrying out the edict throughout the Empire proper, as well as in the Netherlands, where he dwelt for the most part. It was largely owing to his

* The latest impression through WREDE in the Reichstagsakten, II., 640-659; for its publication, 659, n. 1.

† PAQUIER, 271-275.

discreet and indefatigable efforts that the religious innovations were almost entirely suppressed in that country.*

Aleander was still there when Leo X. died. By this event he failed to receive the reward which he had so richly deserved by his untiring energy in the interests of the Church. He had remained unmoved at his post in a foreign land, though exposed to the most violent and venomous attacks from his former friends the humanists. He had endured hardships and physical sufferings of every sort, and at times his life had been in danger. He had, indeed, moments of despondency, especially when he did not consider himself sufficiently supported by Rome. But these were only passing phases; and on the whole he carried on his warfare against the religious innovators with wonderful endurance, ardent zeal, and great prudence and ability. Nothing could have surpassed his zeal against the heretics, which led him, highly-cultivated man as he was, to the use of very abusive language. This is much to be regretted, however great the aggravation to which he was subjected. In fact, he succumbed in this to the custom of his age quite as much as if he had succumbed to the practice of bribery.

Owing to his excitable and violent temperament, Aleander's judgment of events was often at fault. The greatest mistake he made was that of at times attributing the strength of the Lutheran movement to base and material motives: in this he showed himself a true child of the Renaissance. Consequently he trusted too much to being able to stem the movement by marks of

* Cf. the detailed account in KALKOFF, *Die Anfänge der Gegenreformation in der Niederlanden*, in *Des Vereins f. Reformationsgesch.*, 21 Jahrg., Heft 2 and 4, Halle, 1903-1904. Cf. also KALKOFF, *Das Wormser Edikt in den Niederlanden*, in the *Hist. Vierteljahrschr.*, 1905, 69 *seqq.*

favour and a generous expenditure of money, and was therefore untiring in his efforts to win over individuals. He cannot be reproached with the disappointment which awaited the hopes he had based on the issue of the Edict of Worms. No one could have foreseen future developments. Not only Aleander, but all other contemporaries, saw in stringent measures the only way of dealing with the very precarious state of things. Nevertheless, however much Aleander might believe in the efficacy of violent and material methods, he was too clear-sighted to ignore the importance of the use of spiritual weapons. His endeavours to make use of these are shown in a letter which he wrote to Cardinal Medici on the 5th of April, 1521. "I say openly to our poets and rhetoricians," he says, "whose action consists in elaborating verses a month long, and in abusing each other all for the sake of some miserable word, let them be unanimous in defending our faith in their writings. They could accomplish great things by their understanding and capabilities; they could put these shriekers to silence who, with their gifts of narrative and poetry, set themselves up before the multitude as if they had quite succeeded in trampling on theology. Excommunication could make no sort of impression on them, for they only mock at it. Here is a case of driving one wedge on the top of another, and of fighting these people with their own weapons. Would that the Pope, through the intercession of Your Eminence, would, by praise and reward, encourage men of talent to make an intelligent study of Scripture, and put their pens to work, after the example of the Germans, in defence of the faith. In this work God would assist them. There is no need of great doctors of theology to refute these knaves for, as we have seen, they refuse to learn anything of such. I am far from meaning that the antagonists of error should

be devoid of a deep knowledge of Holy Scripture ; but even in so important a matter much depends on literary facility." *

Here we can see how Aleander, as a true humanist, expected less from profound learning than from a skilful use of literature. It was, it is true, a gross delusion to expect lasting results in this great contest from the Roman humanists ; but the principle was right that the enemy must be fought with his own weapons, and that the anti-Catholic literature must be met by one of the same kind, only on the side of truth.

To the honour of Aleander are the unceasing warnings he addressed to the Curia to redress the abuses, which he pointed out with the greatest candour. He adjured the Pope to do away with the number of reservations and dispensations, to revoke the abrogation of the Concordat with Germany, to reform the scandals connected with the Roman Court, to put a curb on the benefice-hunters, and to restore ecclesiastical discipline. Though these warnings were but too often neglected, they make known to us the man who, as Papal Nuncio to the Emperor, served the Holy See with a fiery devotion, and was the immediate precursor of the great Catholic reformers, to whom he ultimately attached himself.

* BALAN, n. 61 ; BRIEGER, n. 19 ; KALKOFF, Aleander, 151. Cf. the Letter of May 8, *loc. cit.*, 221.

APPENDIX
OF
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
AND
EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.

APPENDIX.

PRELIMINARY NOTICE.

THE documents here brought together are intended to substantiate and supplement the text: it did not form part of the plan of my work to make a special collection of original records. I have given, as correctly as possible, the source from which each has been taken, and, from considerations of space, been sparing of explanatory notes. I have, as a rule, conformed to the original spelling in the documents and letters; the alterations as regards capital letters and punctuation require no justification. All emendations of any importance are mentioned; small mistakes and obvious misprints are corrected without special remark. My own additions are placed within square brackets, obscure or doubtful passages are marked by a note of interrogation, or "sic." Passages which, on comparison or, later, in preparation for the press, I have purposely omitted as irrelevant, I have distinguished by dots (. . .).

I take this opportunity of here tendering my most grateful acknowledgments to Prof. Dr. Pogatscher and Pfarrer Dr. Bruder for their invaluable assistance in correcting the following documents, and in revising a considerable portion of my fourth volume; also to Dr. Brom for his correction of the 2nd Book (Adrian VI.), and to Mgr. Ehses for that of the 3rd Book (Clement VII.).

1. STAZIO GADIO TO THE MARCHIONESS OF MANTUA.*

1513, Martii 3, Rom.

V. Ex^{ta} haverà inteso che doppo la morte di papa Julio, il corpo del quale fù portato in S. Pietro vestito con la pianeta di brocato, mitra di brocato doro, accompagnato da tutti li card^{li} e fù posto sopra l'altare di S. Andrea, ove concorse da la matina sino ad due hore di notte tutta Roma per vederlo et per basarli li pedi et far tocar le coroni, beretti et officioli le man, il volto et li panni dil papa con tanta devotione, sel fusse stato il vero corpo di S. Pietro; † alle due hore fù sepolto in capella di papa Sixto havendo seco sotto terra tre anelli et vesti per più di milli et cinquecento ducati. . . . Heri li Romani entrorno in congregatione et obtenero de molte petitioni che havevano dimandati al colegio che havessino le gabelle et alcuni datii, di far card^{li} quatro per li baroni et quatro per li cittadini et di cacciar li monaci di S. Paulo et mettervi canonici Romani, et volere per commendator di S. Spirito uno Romano; il colegio si è rimesso alla deliberatione del futuro papa, promettendo di procurar questo presso S. S^a; il predicto colegio ha donato a casa Colonna il palatio di S. Apostolo. . . . Rome III martii 1513.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

2. POPE LEO X. TO THE CITIZENS OF BOLOGNA.†

1513, Martii 11, Rom.

Dilecti etc. In minoribus constituti et cardinalatus honore ac istius dilectissimae civitatis nostrae legationis munere fungentes quanto amore quantave caritate vos omnes resque vestras fuerimus comp[le]xi neminem vestrum latere credimus. Itaque hac die, quae est XI huius mensis martii, de venerab. fratrum nostrorum S. R. E. cardinalium uno omnium assensu nemine discrepante ac spiritus sancti gratia cooperante licet immeriti ad s. apostolatus apicem assumpti persuadere vobis facile potestis rebus quietique vestrae et pacifico istius nostrae civitatis statui Deo auctore nos

* See *supra*, p. 18.

† Cf. Vol. VI., 436.

‡ See *supra*, p. 34.

bene consulturos esse. In thanksgiving to God "triduales supplicationes" are to be held. Hopes you will continue in devotion.

Dat. Romae apud s. Petrum XI martii 1513 ante nostram coronationem.

[Orig. State Archives, Bologna. Q. 5.]

3. CARDINAL SIGISMONDO GONZAGA TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.*

1513, Martii 11, Rom.

Venere proximo passato, che fù agli IV dil prest^e, intrassimo in conclave, dove sino a questa sera questi miei s^{ri} r^{mi} card^{li} sono stati in longe pratiche per la moltitudine di quelli che pretendevano et correivano al papato et per le affectioni de Spagnoli et de Francesi et interessi de gli stati de Italia ; tandem circa una hora de nocte stringendosi le cose, perchè domatina se doveva fare uno scrutinio, quelli che sono stati contrarii a mons^r r^{mo} de Medici, che erano quasi tutti gli card^{li} vecchii excepto mons^r r^{mo} di S. Georgio et mons^r r^{mo} de Soderini, si sono divisi et, essendosi alcuni de essi adheriti cum noi altri de la parte contraria favorevole al p^{to} r^{mo} s^{re} card^{le} de Medici et ad mons^r r^{mo} di S. Georgio, che ambi doi erano subiecti de gli card^{li} giovani, cioè de gli diaconi, gli altri dubitandosi di S. Georgio, preseron per partito di voler più presto Medici che s. s. r^{ma}, in modo che avedendosi noi di questo, anci essendoni certificato seressimo ad adorare mons^{re} antedetto de Medici, il medesimo feceron tutti loro et così circa una hora di nocte cum gracia del spirito sancto è stato facto papa. Domatina per osservare la forma della electione si farà il scrutinio et si publicarà. Mi rendo certo che haveremo facto uno bono papa, quale attenderà al bene universale di la chiesa et alla pace fra principi christiani. Spero medesimamente per l'anticha amicicia, quale è stato fra la casa de Medici et la nostra et per la observantia di V. S. verso s. s. r^{ma} parimente per la servitù et affectione che sempre io gli ho havuta ultra che sono stato gagliardissimo ad questa sua exaltatione, che S. Sth haverà in specialissima protectione V. S., il stato suo et me, et tanto più mi ralegro

* See *supra*, pp. 15, 16, 22, 25.

quanto che conosco per expresso non poter essere in questa sede persona quale sia in più proposito di lo ill^{mo} s. duca di Urbino, di lo ill^{mo} s. duca di Ferrara et de lo ex^{mo} s. duca di Milano, di quello serà S. S^{ta} per le cause quale so essere note ad V. S., cum la quale mi congratulo cum tutto il cuore. Domatina di molte hore prima che se apri il conclave, se publicarà la electione sua et rendomi certo che subito mons^r Lud^{co} de Fermo scriverà ad V. S. Pur in quest' hora che sono le VIII di nocte non ho voluto manchare di questo officio de scrivere queste poche parole ad V. S., la quale prego voglia comunicare tale bona nova alla ill^{ma} s^{ra} sua consorte et farla intendere ad quelli nostri logotenenti, vicario et clero, acciò rendino le debite gratie a N. S. Dio, et che facino signò di gaudio et consolatione. Questa electione è stata tanto pura quanto mai altra ne fusse facta, non si è parlato de denari ne de beneficii ne de officii, ne di altra promessa o cosa suspecta de symonia. Papa Julio di fe. re. cum la bolla sua da facto paura tale alle brigate, che non è stato persona quale habbi havuto ardire de contravenire ad quella. . . .

Rome in palatio apostolico in conclavi hora VIII noctis veniente die XI mens. martii.

Il nome del novo Papa
è Leone decimo.

El vostro alevo et fid. ser^{re}
S[igismondo] card^{le} di
Gonzaga di manu propria.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

4. ALESSANDRO GABBIONETA TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.*

1513, Juni 17, Rom.

. . . Fu dopoi lecta la cedula de S^{ta} Croce et de mons^r San Severino sotto scritta de lor proprie mane in questa forma senza nominarse card^{le}: Ego B. de Carvaial promitto iuro et manu propria subscripsi; similiter: Ego F. de S^{to} S^{rino} promitto etc^a. In la qual cedula recognoscano per vero et legitimo le sacro Lateranense concilio convocato legitimamente et aprovano et ratificano tute le cose facte et tractate in dicto concilio et prometano far tanto quanto li comanderà N. S. per comovere la S^{ta} sua a mazor clementia verso essi; questa è la substantia, ma la cedula fù molto

* See *supra*, pp. 55, 56.

longa cum iuramenti et molte altre parole. . . . Mercordì passato S. S^{ta} fece concistorio, in el qual tractò de la reductione de questi card^{li}; quello facesse in contrario mons^r r^{mo} Sedunensis seria longo a dir, qual post multa prostratus ad terram dimandò licentia al N. S. cum dir che nolebat sedere cum impiis et per niente voleva star in corte. A la fine maior pars dominorum concluse col N. S., che per ben de la giesia isti reducerentur, ma cum honore sedis apostolice. Questi dui venirano a Roma senza dubio alcuno de card^{le} et intrarano de nocte, andando recta via in palazzo del N. S. et li starano quella nocte; la matina sequente serà consistorio dove serano introducti in habitu longo, ma simplice et li domandarano venia al N. S. et al sacro collegio de li errori lor; post multas ceremonias N. S. et el collegio ge perdonarà et li ponerà l'habito et cappa cardinalesca et li farà sedere. Ma per questo non li serà perho dato li beneficii sed restituuntur ad dignitatem tantummodo, in modo che sel re de Franza non li provide starano molto lezeri. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

5. ALESSANDRO GABBIONETA TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.*

1513, Juni 30, Rom.

. . . Li dui nunc r^{mi} card^{li} S^{ta} Croce et San Severino fureno remissi lunedì prox^o, como che scrisse a V. Ex^{ia} che si dovea fare, et introno in consistorio vestiti da simplici preti et N. S. volse che pasasseno per tute le sale del palazzo, dove era tuta la corte, la qual cosa mosse a pietà molti di veder quelli s^{ri} in quello habito, max^e Sancta Croce, che tremava como fa una foglia; intrati in consistorio et adorato el N. S., Sua S^{ta} ge disse de gran parole et li dette una cedula che dovesseno lezere, in la quale abjuraveno el conciliabulo Pisano, ratificaveno et approbaveno le censure et maledictione et privacione de la s^{ta} mem. de papa Julio et in questo passo N. S. ge disse che le persone loro erano securissime, che quando non li piacesse le proposte, che liberamente, lo declarasseno, che li faria acompagnar dove lor volesseno securamente, in summa feceno ciò che li fù comandato, et de gratia ultimo loco N.S. legie sententia, in la qual li restituite ad honores et dignitates et ad omnia, præterquam ad beneficia de quibus aliis

* See *supra*, p. 56.

est provisum ; poi li fece mettere el rochetto et la cappa et similiter li donò el capello. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

6. PARIS DE GRASSIS, ABOUT THE FIRST CREATION OF
CARDINALS BY LEO X.*

1513, September 23, Rom.

Die lunae, quae fuit XXIII septembris 1513, S. D. N. Leo quatuor cardinales creavit sedentibus in consistorio XX cardinalibus atque aliis omnibus per literas consentientibus, sic enim fuerat in capitulis conclavis stabilitum, ut pontifex in cardinalium creatione teneretur omnes cardinales absentes a Bononia citra vocare ut adessent aut saltem ut consentirent. The Pope addressed the Cardinals as follows :—Filii dilectissimi, profecto gratias ingentes vos Deo inprimis reddere oportet cum istis rev^{mis} dominis cardinalibus, qui vos ex infimis et simplicibus in tantum fastigium assumere dignati sunt, ut eisdem aequales fieri mereamini cardinales sicut ipsi, nempe maximam dignitatem ipsorum beneficio et benignitate assequuti estis, quam si mente plena considerabitis et agnoscetis nunquam cessabitis in Dei optimi maximi laudatione et gratiarum actione adversus praefatos dominos istos rev^{mos}. Nos quoque personas vestras libenter proposuimus, qui maxime speramus, quod totis viribus incumbetis in honorem hunc ac onus digne sufferatis, et impleatis quae sunt ad id opportuna, quae quamvis vos facturos speramus, hortamur tamen et mandamus ut ita [sic] vos in ipsa cardinalatus dignitate sic geratis quod nos de huiusmodi vestra promotione penitere aliquo unquam tempore [non] contingat, in nomine patris etc.

[Cop. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Libr. Vienna,
Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.†]

7. PARIS DE GRASSIS, ABOUT THE ENTRY OF CARDINAL LANG
INTO THE CONSISTORY OF DECEMBER 9TH, 1513.‡

All the Cardinals went on December 9th, 1513, to S. Maria del Popolo and thence accompanied Lang to the Consistory : omnes

* See *supra*, p. 82.

† The Secret Archives contain three other MS. copies of the Diarium for this year : XII., 22 ; XIII., 18 ; XIII., 19.

‡ See *supra*, p. 70.

[cardinales] mantellati, non autem cappati propter continuas pluvias, ipse [Lang] autem cum modica corona capitis et cum capillis longis admodum, super quo cum ipsum arguissem, respondit per iocum se bene fecisse ad imitationem Iesu Christi, qui nunquam aut raro legitur comam posuisse. Habuit etiam birretum pellibus nigris suffultum, quod mirum multis visum est cum ipse sit aetate iuvenis respective. In pompa fuit insignis, nam et 50 muliones habuit omnes uno habitu ornatos, equos fere 300 unico habitu indutos praeter multos nobiles torquatos ac praeter multos oratores qui semper in comitatu sunt, vid. Caesareus, Mediolanensis, Montiferratinus, Ferrariensis, Florentinus, Senensis, Lucensis et alii.

[Cop. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Libr. Vienna, and Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

8. PARIS DE GRASSIS, ABOUT THE IMPERIAL "OBEDIENTIA," ON
DECEMBER 11TH, 1513.*

Eadem die, quae fuit XI decembris, intrarunt quatuor oratores Caesaris ad praestandum obedientiam papae, vid primus ill. dom. dux. Bari, frater ducis Mediolani, qui etiam ingressus fuerat nomine ducis Mediolani praefati, ac rev. p. dom. episcopus Triestinus, il. dom. Albertus Carpensis et ill. dom. Antonius de [Rovere], per portam, quae est in platea palatii, et hospitati sunt hoc mane in domo domini Angeli Neronis, et familiae quasi usque ad portam illius domus obviarunt, nam etiam familia papae ultra imaginem crucifixi obviavit, prout debuit, quia ita fuit et fit erga oratores Caesareos. Multa altercatio fuit inter diversos oratores qui venerunt cum Gurcensi.

[Cop. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Libr. Vienna, and Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

9. PARIS DE GRASSIS, ABOUT THE ARRIVAL OF BONNIVET AT
VITERBO ON NOVEMBER 2ND, 1515.†

Eadem die orator regis Franciae ingressus fuit solemniter, a familiis cardinalium et pontificis receptus fuit cum solemnitate et

* See *supra*, p. 70.

† See *supra*, p. 129.

ductus ad hospitium coronae. Is fuit monsignor de Bonivetto laicus, et papa mihi imposuit, ut eum honorifice recipi et tractari facerem prout feci more solito.

[Cop. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Libr. Vienna, and Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

10. CONSISTORY AT VITERBO ON NOVEMBER 5TH, 1515.*

Die lunae 5 novembris fuit consistorium secretum in arce praesentibus XIV cardinalibus, in quo conclusum fuit de transmigratione pontificis et curiae versus Florentiam ac inde Bononiam pro rege Franciae excipiendo, et papa dixit quod die XX volebat Senas ingredi et die s. Andreae Florentiam ingrederetur, ubi circa XV dies permaneret; deinde versus Bononiam iret, ubi regem exciperet et festa natalia perageret, ac rursus Florentiam reverteretur et postea Pisas iret solatii gratia; inde ad urbem Romam rediret ante dominicam palmarum, quia omnino intendebat palmas in Roma dare, et prorogavit sessionem concilii Lateranensis ad XV diem post pascha et imposuit mihi, ut simul cum rev. dom. Anthonitano et sanctor. quatuor cardinalibus facerem rotulum de omnibus officialibus curiae qui et quot ex quoquo ordine deberent sequi pontificem, et sic eadem die fecimus et conclusimus in hunc modum . . . [the names follow]. In eodem consistorio creatus est legatus urbis rev. dom. card. Vulteranus. . . .

[Cop. Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Libr. Vienna, and Rossiana Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

11. POPE LEO X. THREATENS FRANCESCO MARIA DELLA ROVERE WITH THE MAJOR EXCOMMUNICATION.†

1516, Martii 1, Kom.

Leo episc. servus etc. Ad fut. rei mem. Ex ore sedentis . . . Cum itaque retroactis temporibus Franciscus Maria fe. re. Julii pape secundi predecessoris nostri secundum carnem nepos non

* See *supra*, p. 129.

† See *supra*, 149.

ex linea sive successione investiture, sed ex gratia sedis apostolice et tanquam adoptivus filius bon. mem. Guidonis ducis Urbini ad ducatum ipsum pervenerit et in juvenili ac immatura etate ab ecclesia Romana et sede apostolica contra ejus hostes postpositis ceteris capitanei titulo decoratus magnoque stipendio conductus fuerit, certamen ac belli victoriam manifestam perfide detrectavit et quod deterius ac magis horrendum est contra sedem apostolicam, contra patrum et contra fidem a qua feudum dicitur feudatarius et vassallus per prodicionem ad partes hostium contra S^{am} Rom. Ecclesiam tunc venientium defecit demumque ipsius S^{te} Rom. Ecclesie card^{lem} (hactenus in expiatum inauditumque facinus) propriis manibus interfecit, a quo crimine absolutionem per suspectissimos testes magis extorsit quam meruit, premissis omnibus quasi conniventibus oculis a Julio praefato predecessore nostro toleratis eique civitate Pisauri in feudum liberalissime concessa, nichil minus a cedibus et sanguine temperans plures vulneravit, plures etiam propriis manibus occidit. Quibus omnibus posthabitis nos divina gratia ad summi apostolatus apicem assumpti quamquam plurimum querelis pulsati nedum ipsum pacienter tulimus ob mem. fe. re. Julii predecessoris predicti, cui nos plurimum debuisse fatemur, verum etiam magno stipendio conduimus contra hostes nostros et S^{te} Rom. Ecclesie tunc in Italiam adventantes, qui tantum absuit ut munus ei demandatum impleret, ut post multas dilationes, post varias cavillosasque et dissimulatas condiciones clam cum hostibus sentiens palam tandem cum magno sedis apostolice discrimine ad eos defecit revocatisque militibus jam ad bellum proficiscentibus retentisque per dolum quatuordecim millibus ducatis ei pro stipendio jam solutis domi proditorie se continuit. . . . Therefore the excommunication threatens him and his adherents: prefatum Franciscum Mariam ducem eiusque complices, fautores, adherentes, consultores et sequaces . . . auctoritate omnipotentis Dei . . . per presentes in virtute S^{te} obedientie ac sub maioris* excommunicationis late sententie . . . nec non criminis lese majestatis rebellionisque et aliis infradicendis penis quas ipso facto si monitioni et mandatis nostris predictis non paruerint . . . incurrere volumus, per presentes requirimus et monemus . . . quatenus infra XVIII dies . . . prefatus

* "maioris" has been inserted above the line, in another hand.

Franciscus Maria dux eiusque complices . . . coram nobis . . . personaliter compareant.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. (secre.) 1193 f. 115-121.*]

12. POPE LEO X. TO ROBERTO LATINO ORSINI.†

1516, April 2, Rom.

Leo etc. dilecto filio Roberto Latino de Ursinis, electo Regin. ad Hungarie Bohemie ac Polonie regna necnon universas provincias civitates terras et loca carissimis in Christo filiis Ludovico Hungarie et Bohemie ac Sigismundo Polonie regibus illustribus mediate et immediate subiecta nostro et apostolice sedis cum plena potestate legati de latere nuncio et oratori salutem etc.‡ Cum nuper audivissemus olim clare mem. Wladislai Hungarie et Bohemie regis [obitum] sane pro eo ac debuimus haud mediocrem animi molestiam meroremque percepimus considerantes presertim quam singularis prudentie rege ac principe regnum ipsum Hungaricum viduaturn orbatumque esset, quantamve in eius amissione iacturam universa Christiana respublica passa fuerit, quippe qui pro divini nominis gloria et orthodoxe fidei exaltatione nullis laboribus nullisque expensis parcendo velut intrepidus Christi pugil ac fortissimus athleta contra immanissimam Turcorum rabiem stare continuosque illorum impetus et horribilem ferociam arcere ac retundere insuperque gloriosissimos de illis triumphos reportare consueverat. Nos autem dum onus universalis gregis dominici superna dispositione nobis iniunctum diligenter attendimus et nostrum perspicimus imperfectum videntes quod nequimus circa singula per nosmet ipsos exolvere debitum apostolice servitutis, nonnunquam viros electos scientia et dignitate preditos ac virtute

* The document ends here with the words : "incursum Dat." Then follows in another hand : "Dat. Romae apud s. Petr. anno inc. d. 1516 p. Kl. martii pont. nostri anno tertio." The "p" before "Kl. martii" seems to be, as an abbreviation for "pridie," unusual. It is more likely that the scribe intended to write "pontif. nostri" or "primo," and then forgot to erase the "p." In the exceedingly rare copy of the *Monitorium poenale* (Rossiana Libr., Vienna) it is dated "1515 (st. fl.) Cal. Mart."

† See *supra*, 216.

‡ on the margin : Bembus.

conspicuos in partem sollicitudinis assumimus, ut ipsis vires nostras suppleantibus ministerium nobis commissum favente pietate superna facilius efficacius et salubrius exequamur, et, quamvis ad cunctorum Christifidelium provincias civitates ac regna paternum studium et diligentiam adhibeamus, ad ipsum tamen Hungaricum regnum, quod Christianitatis totius adversus infidelium conatus inexpugnabile presidium ac tutissimum antemurale semper extitit, aciem nostre considerationis paternis affectibus dirigentes illud eiusque incolas et habitatores tanquam pro fidei nostre custodia assidue vigilantes ac peculiare filios diligentiori cura intuemur et super eorum felici regimine pacifico et tranquillo desideramus specialiter providere ut preserventur a noxiis et optatis prefruantur incrementis. Cum itaque ob recentem decessum* prefati regis in dicto regno aliquarum dissensionum ac discordiarum zizanie satore procurante periculum exoriri possit, unde universa respublica Christiana detrimentum pateretur, cum regnum ipsum ut prediximus Christianitatis totius firmum presidium et antemurale dignoscatur, et ad nostrum spectet officium omni cura et vigilancia providere, quod omnia regna Christianorum et illorum incole et habitatores prefati in pacis et quietis dulcedine conquiescant, et ob hanc causam et ut sancta per eos contra prefatos Christi nominis hostes expeditio susciperetur, alias dilectum filium nostrum Thomam tituli sancti Martini in montibus presbyterum card^{lem} Strignoien. nostrum et apostolice sedis legatum, quem prae-fatus Wladislaus rex in eius ultimo testamento prefato Ludovico regi tutorem ut eius prudentia et auctoritate negotia regni eius expedirentur reliquit, destinaverimus, licet preter spem et desiderium nostrum post destinationem huiusmodi quam plura inter plebeios et nobiles scandala exorta fuerint, nos ad te, quem magnitudine consilii eximia quoque integritate probitate fidelitate ac precipua prudentia comprobatum habemus, cuius affectibus geritur prout indubitanter credimus unacum prefato Thoma cardinali sedare discordias iusticie terminos colere ac errantes ad viam reducere veritatis, mentem nostram potissime convertentes sperantesque quod ea que tibi duxerimis committenda gratia tibi assistente divina circumspecte iuste et fideliter exequeris, te qui etiam referendarius et prelatus domesticus ac secundum carnem affinis noster existis, ad ponendam in dicto regno pro

* *Ms*: diocessum.

illius salute pacem concordiam quietem et tranquillitatem armaque adversus Christi nominis hostibus [sic] concordibus animis ac viribus feliciter convertenda et pro nonnullis aliis nostris et Romane ecclesie arduis negotiis pertractandis ad car^{mos} in Christo filios nostros Ludovicum Hungarie ac Bohemie ac Sigismundum Polonie reges illustres eorumque regna provincias civitates terras et loca ad omnipotentis Dei laudem Christianeque reipublice statum et honorem nostrum et apostolice sedis nuncium et oratorem cum plena potestate legati de latere in presentiarum destinamus teque in dictis regnis provinciis civitatibus terris et locis nostrum et dicte sedis nuncium et oratorem cum dicta potestate usque ad nostrum et sedis eiusdem beneplacitum auctoritate apostolica tenore presentium constituimus et etiam deputamus, confidentes per hoc, ut firma spes est nostra, quod dextera domini tibi assistente propicia ex sollicitis operibus tuis dictis regnis provinciis civitatibus terris et locis illorumque incolis et habitatoribus desiderata proveniant commoda fructusque exinde succedent [sic] salutare. Tu igitur munus huiusmodi devota mente suscipiens te in illius executione sic sollicitum ac verbo sermone et opere studiosum et diligentem exhibeas, quod ex tuis laboribus et actionibus fructus optati, quos speramus, succedant tuque per sollicitudinem tuam illam glorie palmam que etiam parum procurantibus celesti retributione impenditur digne consequi merearis et non immerito possis apud nos et sedem predictam de tam bono opere commendari. Datum Rome apud S. Pet. anno incar. dom. 1516^o, 4^o non. aprilis pont. nostri a. 4^o.

Visa C. de Liazaris.

Ja. Questenberg.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1196, f. 201.*]

13. AGOSTINO GONZAGA TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1516, September 5, Rom.

To-day, in the name of the Marquis, he earnestly intercedes with Leo X. for Francesco Maria della Rovere. S. B^{ne} me rispose in questo modo : M. Augustino voi sapeti quello che ve dicessimo a la venuta vostra in Roma circa li casi de quel povro homiciolo

* Faculties for R. L. Orsini of the same date : Regest. Vat. 1197 f. 188 (Sec. Arch. of the Vatican).

† See *supra*, p. 156.

de Francesco Maria, qual versi di noi havea usato termini, che non solo de privarlo del stato havevamo ragione, ma de mille vite se tante ne avesse havute, et certo quando voi venisti in quà havevamo tal animo verso di esso, che non solo in Mantua o sul Mantuano, dove se retrova, non lo havessimo lassato star, ma in loco del mondo, se ben li havessimo dovuto spender tutto el papato nostro. Pur quando voi venesti a noi mandato dal s. marchese qual certo amamo cordialm^{te}, se vedessimo di boniss^a yoglia como anche vi veggiamo hora et se resolvessemo como sapeti hora ve disemo che siamo contentissimi che Francesco Maria se affermi et reposi sul paese del signor marchese, ben perho dandosi esso Francesco Maria quelle cautioni che a questi di li forno ricercate e date a voi in scritto da monsig. rev^{mo} qui; et perchè voi ce havete fatto intendere che esso Francesco Maria è contento assentir al tutto dal capitolo de Sora in fuori, volemo che voi rescrivati ad sig. marchese che siamo contenti che dicto Francesco Maria se ne possi impacciar a modo suo et noi promettemo che non se ne impaccieremo; vero è che non volemo che questo si veddi in scritto, perchè seria un prejudicar de le ragioni nostre che havimo sopra quel feudo del reame et circa li fidejussori che ci faceti intender detto Francesco Maria non mancar de ogni opera perchè se trovino, li volemo in ogni modo como haveti potuto intendere da monsig. rev^{mo}; sichè scrivetilo al s. marchese et fati che S. S. ce resolvì et como più presto meglio significandoli che se non fosse el rispetto de S. Ex. non seressimo mai venuti a questo.

[Orig. Library, Mantua I e/3-4.]

14. POPE LEO X. TO THE CARDINALS ABOUT THE CRUSADE.*

1516, December 27, Rom.

In die s. Iohannis. Post missam papa vocatis ad se cardinalibus sedens in solio intimavit qualiter Turcus subiugaverat Soldanum et in suam potestatem receperat omnem illius statum et etiam Hyerusalem ac precipue sepulchrum domini nostri Iesu Christi licet dicatur quod Christianos propterea nullo novo

* See *supra*, p. 219.

incommodo vexaverit pro nunc, et visus est papa velle eos hortari ut cogitent quomodo possint resistere huic si forte vellet tentare aditum ad Christianitatem. Responsum est ei bonum fore si missis legatis ad principes christianos uniant eos in pace universali.

[Paris de Grassis, **Diarium*, Rossiana Library, Vienna, and Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

15. POPE LEO X. ABOUT THE CRUSADE.*

Missa in die circumcisionis,

1517, Januar. 1.

Papa venit ad hanc missam licet excusaverit se repletum tussi et catarro . . . et in fine missae papa indicavit cardinalibus ad se vocatis qualiter Turchus expulerat Soldanum et vicerat Cairum sive Babiloniam et sepulchrum domini nostri Jesu Christi conquisiverat, et propterea bonum esset si desuper fieret aliqua consultatio inter ipsos ad obstandum ei ne citra ad nos veniat, et conclusum fuit quod die crastina omnes hora XIX convenirent ad se, et sic convenerunt, sed papa propter catarrum et tussim nihil potuit concludere.

[Paris de Grassis, **Diarium*, Rossiana Library, Vienna, and Sec. Archives of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

16. POPE LEO X. TO KING FRANCIS I. OF FRANCE.†

1517, Januar. 4, Rom.

Sends to the Congress at Cambrai: dil. fil. Nicolaum de Scomberg ord. predicat. familiar. nostrum nobisque propter eius egregias virtutes et religionem apprime et prolatum et charum, ut pro nostra in vos paterna voluntate et affectu eo in conventu una cum nostris nunciis adsit, quo res facilius ad universalem omnium Christianorum principum ineundam et tractandam pacem succedant, hoc presertim tempore, quo propter incredibiles Turcar. tyranni successus ingentemque contra Aegiptios partam victoriam necesse est ut agi per nos ea de re, si vere Christiani sumus, ne differatur. Credential for: Nic. Scomberg.

Dat. Romae 1517 ianuar. 4, p. n. a. 4°.

P. Bembus.

[Orig. National Archives, Paris, L. 357.]

* See *supra*, p. 219.

† See *supra*, p. 167.

17. POPE LEO X. TO PROSPERO COLONNA.*

1517, Martii 12, Magliana nr. Rom.

Dilecte etc. Intelligentes sollicitari te a quibusdam ut milites hominesque tuos eis commodos ad praesentem Senarum statum illiusque civitatis, quae sub nostra et huius S. Sedis protectione est, quietem perturbandam, licet id difficillime adduci possumus ut credamus, existimavimus tamen pro tua in nos eandemque sedem reverentia et officio, cum domicellus Romanus sis, nostraque in te paterna charitate atque affectu te illis nihil eiusmodi concessurum; volumus autem his et nostris litteris te hortari, ut milites hominesque tuos omnino contineas neque permittas ut cum molientibus res novas contraque nostram et huius sedis dignitatem se commisceant; id erit nobis summopere gratum atque in eo multum a nobis et eadem sede promereberis.

Dat. in villa nostra Malliana sub annulo pisc. die XII martii

1517 a^o 4. Bembus.

[Orig. Colonna Archives, Rome, Brevi n. 61.]

18. ALESSANDRO GABBIONETA TO TOLEMEO SPAGNOLO,
SECRETARY TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1517, April 1, Rom.

Hoggi N. S. ha fatto uno longo consistorio, nel quale ha fatto dui card^{li}, uno ad instantia del re cath^{co}, nepote de mons^r de Chievres, et questo è publicato, e laltro è larcivescovo Bituricensis ad instantia della matre del re ch^{mo}, et questo non è publicato, ma N. S. habuit vota patrum; de altri nulla fuit facta mentio. In eodem consistorio mons^r r^{mo} de S^{ta} Maria in Portico est publicatus legatus exercitus ecclesiastici. N. S. in questo proposito parlò qualiter el duca Lorenzo era sta ferito et ben che el sperasse chel fosse per guarire . . .

Rome p^{ma} ap^{is} 1517.

S. Archidiaconus.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

19. CONSISTORY OF 20TH APRIL, 1517.‡

S^{mus} D. N. fecit verbum de rebus Turcharum et de periculo quod toti reipublicae Christianae imminet, nisi totis viribus

* See *supra*, p. 172.

† See *supra*, p. 169, and Vol. VIII.

‡ See *supra*, p. 220.

occurratur, et Sua S^{tas} deputavit r^{mos} d. videlicet Raphaellem Hostiensem sancti Georgii, Franciscum Surrentinum episcopos, Nicolaum tituli sancte Prisce de Flisco, Adrianum tituli sancti Grisogoni presbiteros, Alexandrum de Farnesio sancti Eustachii, Marcum s. Mariae in via lata Cornelium diaconos cardinales, qui cogitarent, quibus potissimum dandum esset munus legationis ad principes et reges Christianos et quid interim per S^{tem} Suam agendum censerent et postmodum in consistorio referrent.

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

20. CONSISTORY OF 19TH MAY 1517.*

Romae die martis 19 m. maii 1517 fuit congregatio in palatio apost. et expedita fuerunt infrascripta. S. D. N. dixit, cum diebus superioribus habuisset quasi certa et manifesta inditia ex confessione facta per quendam Marchum Antonium Ninum Senensem rev^{mi} card^{lis} de Petrutiis domus magistrum, qui a praefato cardinali in mandatis habuerat, ut magistro Johanne Baptista de Vercellis chirurgo ministro et auctore fistulam Suae S^{tis}, quae [sic] in sede patitur, veneno inficeret idque nephandum consilium rev. d. card. de Saulis et aliis nonnullis complicitibus pluries communicaverat, propterea visum fuit Suae S^{ti}, ut veritati locus esset et ne talia in oculis Suae S^{tis} perpetrata impunita et in exemplum aliorum transirent, ipsos dom. cardinales de Petrutiis et de Saulis in castello S. Angeli deponi et detineri, quousque obiecta contra eos habita purgarent; et ut rev. domini intelligerent S^{tem} Suam hac in re, ut aequum est, mature procedere velle, deputavit rev. dom. Surrentinum episcopum, Anconitanum presbyterum et Alex. de Farnesio diaconum cardinales commissarios qui processus factos et fiendos in huiusmodi causa viderent et examinarent, ut Suae S^{ti} consulere possent.

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

21. ERCOLE DE CORTE TO THE MARQUIS OF MANTUA.†

1518, Mai 27, Rom.

Per dar aviso a V. Ill. S. de alcune cose che hoccore qui in corte di Roma penso quela averà a piacere de intender: a li di

* See *supra*, p. 175.

† See *supra*, p. 196.

pasati fù concistorio, nel concistorio fù dito de voler privare el card^{le} Adriano del capel non venendo a obedientia a la S^{ta} del papa, ma fù concluso li fuse mandato uno breve che venese prometendoli S. S^{ta} de non li far dispiacere. Mons^r card^{le} Horsino per esser lui amico del card^{le} Adriano tolse questa fonte de farlo venire impetrando da la S^{ta} del papa de scriverli ce venese e che lo asecurava in uno de li soi casteli, qual lui volea ; la matina sequente il card^{le} Horsino spaciò una stafeta, qual hè uno che si domanda el Spagna suo sotscalco, con lo dito breve et sua litera aciò venese ; el dito Spagna è tornato et dice che el card^{le} Adriano avea deliberato venir a Roma ; da poi la deliberacion sua de venir fù meso una acitatione per sussi li muri de Venetia de questo tenor, sel cardinal Adriano non venia a obedientia da la S^{ta} del papa seria privato del capel ; como questo sentite se mutò della deliberacion fata de venir, al contrario dicendo che molto di questo si maravigliava, che se dovea venir volea lo breve del N. S. più cauto et più promissio ne la Santità del N. S. se excusato che avea mandato quela acitatione acio venese più presto ; et di novo dito Spagna torna a Venetia con uno altro breve sottoscritto de man de la S^{ta} del papa che lui venga supra la sua fede che non li farà despiacere capitulando che non posa quando serà venuto in Roma partirse sencia licentia de Sua S^{ta} ; ancora ge scrive el card^{le} de Medici che debia venir sopra la sua fede ; la S^{ta} del N. S. ancora li fo scrivere a tutti li ambasatori che sono quì in Roma del re de Romani et del re di Portogalo et del re di Frantia et della S. de Venetia et del re de Spagna che pur venga che non li serà fato despiacer avendo S. S^{ta} promiso a tuti li diti ambasatori la fede. Hozi se parte e sopradito Spagna pur a stafeta ; se dice non venendo serà privato de certo ; io ho cercato de intender a che efeto se fa tanta instantia che questo card^{le} venga ; io ho inteso per esser lui homo teribile, como hè, lo papa dubita, stando in Venetia non tramase qualche cosa in dano suo et non andase in le tere de Colonesi dal card^{le} Voltera grandissimo inimico del papa e faceseno qualche novo tratato ; in el animo mio penso lo potria far ancora ad altro efeto che non lo sapese se non la fantasia del papa, dio ge la mandi bona. Quanto io scrivo a V. Ill. S. quela creda che tal cosa no se sa per tuto, anzi se governa secretamente, ma io me son informato de quanto scrivo dal secretario de mons^r cardinal Horsino chel tuto pasa per le man sue

qual hemi amicisimo e questo ho fato per eser io desideroso como bon servitore de far intendere a la Ill^a S. V. . . . Roma die 27 maii 1518.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

22. CONSISTORY OF 29TH MAY, 1517.*

Romae die veneris 29 m. maii 1517. . . . Insuper Sua S^{tas} exposuit quod heri vocaverat rev. dom. Franciscum episc. Albanen. Surrentinum nuncupatum, Petrum de Acoltis presbiterum cardinalem Anconitanum et Alex. Farnesium s. Eustachii diaconum cardinales commissarios deputatos in causa cardinalium detentorum, quibus processus factos super confessione facta per dom^{nos} Alphonsum de Petrutiis, Bindinellum de Saulis diaconos cardinales et Marchum Antoninum [sic] Ninum p^{ti} dom. card^{lis} de Petrutiis domus magistrum communicaverat eisque legendos tradiderat, ut dominationes suae dictis processibus lectis et bene examinatis S^{ti} Suae consulerent quid in tanta re agendum esset de cardinalibus complicitibus in processu nominatis, qui rev. dom. commissarii consilium dederunt, prout de iure fieri posse affirmabant, ut cardinales complices capi et detineri possent quousque obiecta purgarent, et ob id, cum rev. dom. card. S. Georgii nominaretur inter complices nonnullaque inditia contra eum essent, visum fuit Suae S^{ti} de consilio tamen rev. dom. commissariorum eundem dominum in palatio detineri quousque inditia purgaret, et Sua S^{tas} mihi vicecancellario mandaverat ut in societate p^{ti} rev. card^{lis} S. Georgii manerem quousque eadem S^{tas} Sua aliud de eo deliberaret, idque a me summa obedientia factum est, ob idque consistorio interesse non potui.

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

23. CONSISTORY OF 5TH JUNE, 1517.†

Romae die veneris quinta m. junii 1517. S. N. E. dixit se hesternae die rev. dom. cardinalem S. Georgii in arcem S. Angeli misisse quia recusabat confiteri quae perpetrata fuerant contra personam Suae S^{tis} una cum aliis duobus cardinalibus detentis qui

* See *supra*, p. 178.

† See *supra*, pp. 178, 197.

errorem suum confitebantur et ipsum dom. S Georgii conscium et participem nonnullorum affirmabant, propterea ad indagandam veritatem eo ipsum miserat. Fecit etiam verbum de creandis novis cardinalibus et dixit quod cum essent quattuor tempora, in quibus de creatione novorum cardinalium agi solitum est et ut servaretur laudabilis consuetudo ad imitationem sanctorum patrum, visum fuit Suae S^{ti} cum nonnullos cardinales de proximo creare intenderet rev^{mos} dominos hac de re certiores facere, ut cogitare possent qui potissimum ad hanc dignitatem eligendi essent et qui alias nominarentur promovendi.

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

24. CONSISTORY OF 8TH JUNE, 1517.*

Romae die lunae 8 m. junii 1517. S. D. N. convocatis de more patribus apud eos huiusmodi verba habuit: Ex inditiis et confessionibus cardinalium detentorum manifeste constare duos alios cardinales ibi praesentes una cum aliis complices et conscios conspirationis fuisse seque non sine magna animi molestia quotidie conqueri et ea dicere molestum est quae sibi et aliis fastidium et dolorem pariant, nescire tamen se ulterius a quo potissimum caveri debeat. . . .

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

25. PARIS DE GRASSIS ABOUT THE CONSISTORY OF 8TH JUNE, 1517.†

Die lunae VII junii Papa in consistorio sedens iussit mihi, ut omnibus oratoribus, qui illuc venerant, inhiherem ne inde discederent, sed expectarent extra consistorium donec eos vocari iuberet intra consistorium, et mihi etiam iussit, ut expectarem: itaque cum diu multumque morati fuisset Papa me intro vocari iussit. Ego fui prima facie dubitans ne Papa vellet ex castello per me vocari facere cardinales ibi carceratos, ut processui interessent simul cum oratoribus, quem legi facere vellet, et cum introgressus

* See *supra*, p. 179.

† See *supra*, p. 179.

fuissem vidi omnes cardinales male contentos et sufflantes ac inter se ipsos sollicitos et valde moestos illicoque dubitavi Papam voluisse carceratos tres privare et degradare, et Papa conversus ad cardinales dixit eis, antequam aliud faciamus vultis confiteri qui estis in peccato vel ne, alioquin nos coacti ponemus vos in castello ubi alii sunt. Ego autem hoc audito converti faciem ad fratrem meum cardinalem de Grassis, de quo etiam dubitavi, non quia timerem eum conscium facinoris, sed ne ob invidiam aliquid sibi impingi fecissent maligni susurriones, et ipse in me tacite inspiciebat indicavit se non esse de inquisitis, et Papa mihi iussit ut exirem per modicum tempus; itaque cum etiam diutius mansissent, tandem omnes exierunt quamvis mesti et solliciti et pene desperati, et cum nihil posset a quoquam ex eis intelligi de actis ibidem praesertim quia, ut dictum postea fuit, Papa terribile mandatum eis fecit, ne aliquid de ibi factis aut dictis revelarent, sed ut fieri semper solet omni inde ad breve tempus patefacta sunt.*

[Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Library, Vienna,
and Sec. Arch. of the Vatican (XII., 23).]

26. BELTRANDO COSTABILI † TO THE DUKE ALFONSO OF
FERRARA. ‡

1517 Juni 10, Rom.

Postscriptum. § Lo è comune opinione che de li duy cardinali lo uno sia il cardinale Adriano et laltro sia il cardinale Frenese on il cardinale de Grassis et se ha chel cardinale s. Georgio ha confessato pienamente et similmente li altri per quanto se expecta ad cadauno de loro. Il cardinale de Siena è stato tirato alla corda, cardinale Saulo et s. Georgio è stato denegato el mangiare, bere et dormire per tormento. De s. Georgio il papa have habuto sino qui xii^m ducati quali se trovava in capsula et li pegni de Sua Santità il teneva per vii^m ducati li havea imprestati questi di passati et ha voluto inventario de ogni cosa se li trova, et credese per alcuni chel cardinale Cornaro habii accusato.

[Orig. State Archives, Modena.]

* Sequel in ARMELLINI, 48 *seq.*

‡ See *supra*, pp. 176, 180.

† Episcopus Adriensis.

§ In cipher.

27. BELTRANDO COSTABILI TO THE DUKE ALFONSO OF
FERRARA.*

1517, Juni 24, Rom.

Lo era qualche opinione chel Cornaro fusse stato partecipe de questa conspiratione contro la persona di Nostro Signore et chel predicto la havesse propalata ; ma hora chel processo se è publicatto, se è veduto che tale opinione è falsa. Et la cosa è venuta in luce per certe littere de Marcho Antonio † responsive a quelle del quondam cardinale de Siena, le quale littere sono venute in mano di Nostro Signore et non se scia per che via. Pare che essendo el dicto quondam cardinale a Genazano, scrivesse qui a Marcho Antonio dicesse al Vercelli cioè mastro Baptista andasse a lui a Genazano et che dicto Marcho Antonio li parlò et respose per una sua megia in cifara,‡ como el Vercelli perseverava in voluntade de volerlo servire et chel se offerriva servirlo ad ogni modo et che lo havea boni megì per intrare in casa del papa, cioè Serapicha et Julio di Bianchi,§ et credea ge havesse a succedere, et dubitava, se lo andava a Genazano, el seria pilgiato suspecto et poi non seria acceptato, ma che tuta volta el faria quello chel volesse, et questa littera non se scia per che via sia venuta in mano al papa. Do poi, essendosi detenuto Marcho Antonio solo per cosse de stato, cioè di quello de Siena, sopra dicta littera fù examinato cum la tortura et epso pensando chel patrone fusse on preso on morto, non potendo negare che la littera non fusse sua, la dezifarò et confesò. Do poi essendosi su la pratica de fare venire el dicto quondam cardinale de Siena, la Santità di Nostro Signore comise che quello Vercelli, quale se ritrovava a F'ioenza, fusse observato et li deputo homini lo accompagnassero et di et nocte soto spetie de amititia ; poi, essendo venuto qui epso quondam cardinale de Siena pensando non havere a rendere computo de altro che de cosse del stato de Siena, et essendo stato detenuto insieme cum Sauli, se ha facto pilgiare quello mastro Baptista et condurre qui et lo uno et laltro ha confessato de modo che la cossa se è chiarita et declarata bene apertamente ; et li cardinali stendo prima su la negativa et volendo lo uno vedere quello havea scripto lo altro,

* See *supra*, pp. 173, 196.† Nino ; see *supra*, p. 173.‡ Cf. JOVIUS, *Vita Leonis X.*, l. iv.§ JOVIUS, *loc. cit.*, makes no mention of Serapica.

poi lo hebbero veduto, hano poi dicto tuto quello et più che hano potuto lo uno a graveza de laltro et cussi ogni cosa è venuta in luce et verificase el dicto de lo Evangelio: Nihil occultum quod non reveletur. Il Pochintesta è stato morto solo per havere tenuto pratica col signor Francesco Maria et credesse ne habii facto grande instantia al vescovo Petrucio castellano di Santo Àngelo, quale se ritrova a Siena; quello Marcho Antonio et mastro Baptista presto, secondo se tene, morirano de morte atroce. De li già cardinali autem per anchora non se scia quello altro ne habii a succedere. De continuo me racomando in gratia de Vostra Excellentia. Rome XXIII junii MDXVII.

[Orig. State Archives, Modena.]

28. CONSISTORY OF 26TH JUNE, 1517.*

Romae die veneris 26 m. junii 1517. Cum S. D. N. proposuisset de creandis 27 cardinalibus, quorum nomina legit prout in cedula Sue S^{tas} in qua inter ceteros facta fuit mentio de creandis duobus cardinalibus vid. uno de domo de Columna et altero de domo de Ursinis non specificatis nominibus, et vota a rev. d. cardinalibus exquisivisset, praefatique rev^{mi} domini unanimiter et de communi consensu vota dederunt et consenserunt hac tamen conditione ut Sua S^{tas} XV vel XVI cardinales impre-entiarum publicaret, ceteri vero per bullam crearentur cum potestate quod S. D. N. illos post aliquot menses absque aliqua votorum requisitione vel si periculum mortis, quod Deus averteret, immineret, S. S^{tas} publicare posset ad ejus libitum, cumque praefata S^{tas} cepisset nominare, quos in praesentia publicare intendebat, visum fuit Sue Bⁿⁱ omnibusque rev^{mis} dominis publicationem hujusmodi differre usque ad primum consistorium, et sic fuit conclusum et Sua S^{tas} silentium imposuit omnibus sub censuris.

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives
of the Vatican.]

29. PARIS DE GRASSIS ABOUT THE NEGOTIATIONS OF 26TH JUNE, 1517, RELATING TO THE CREATION OF CARDINALS.†

De cardinalibus novis creandis. Die veneris XXVI junii papa dedit habitum prothonotariatus aliquibus suis domesticis animo

* See *supra*, p. 200.

† See *supra*, p. 200.

faciendi eos cardinales simul cum aliis multis vidi XXVII* numero quae res cum videretur nova et insolita irrita est a multis praesertim cardinalibus, qui licet primo restiterint tamen, ut audio, conclusum est hac ipsa die, ut papa posset eosdem in dicto numero creare et nominare, et cum multo tempore mansisset intra cameram suam ratiocinans cum uno quoque antiquo cardinali super voto cuiusque habendo tandem colloquutione finita papa dixit mihi, quod ex quo hora tarda erat quasi XXIII diei et ipse esset ieiunus ac cardinales forte ieiuni aut saltem fessi et fastiditi quod non videbatur sibi sermonem in longum protrahendum esse in consistorio, sed quod concluderet in primum futurum consistorium creari novos cardinales et si non omnes XXVII* prout proposuerat saltem pro nunc XII aut XV et reliquos ante festum nativitatis Christi quia videbat cardinales ad hoc inclinari. Itaque vix consistorium ingressus per mediam horam ibi mansit et res non conclusa sed exclusa fuit cum risu et expectatione vana multorum ac fere totius curiae quae omnino et pro certo erat ut hac die cardinales crearentur XXVII* sed non fuerunt.

[Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Libr. Vienna, and
Sec. Arch. of the Vatican (XII., 23).]

30-31. PARIS DE GRASSIS ABOUT THE GREAT CREATION OF
CARDINALS OF 1ST JULY, 1517.†

Creatio cardinalium novorum numero XXXI. Die mercurii prima julii papa mihi ad suam capellam pro missa audienda vocato dixit se velle eo consistorio cardinales iam conclusos creare et publicare ex quibus aliqui sui domestici erant qui adhuc in habitu praelaturae non erant et propterea volebat eis dare habitum prothonotariatus prout fecit post missam auditam, nam ipse stans imposuit rochetum datario, deinde comiti Herculi de Rangonibus, tum dom. Francisco Armellino clerico camerae, hinc nepoti suo de Ridolfis et demum dom. Augustino Trivultio quos omnes postea creavit cardinales simul cum multis aliis, et dixit mihi quod expectarem citra consistorium quia sperabat multos alios simul creare quos ego ex domibus eorum facerem vocari ad se in consistorium, et cum replicarem posse eosdem moneri ut prius

* *Ms.* XII., 22, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican has, XXVIII.

† See *supra*, pp. 200, 205.

venirent ne postea papa et cardinales nimis diu expectarent non voluit quia nesciebat pro certo an illos quos designaverat posset concludere prout fuit. Itaque cum diu in consistorio sedissent tandem card^{lis} de Medicis exivit ad me de mandato papae et dedit mihi listam cum nominibus cardinalium noviter creatorum ut illos publicarem et ad consistorium vocari facerem prout feci; nam ego ad cameram vicinam feci convocari XXX parafrenarios papae et iussi ut ibi sustinerent donec eis dicerem quid eos facere oporteret, et sic publicavi [the following as far as "absens" in Raynaldus, 1517 n. 101]. Itaque mandavi parafrenariis papae ut ex his multos qui nec seperabant nec cogitabant adire et vocarent ad papam ipsos in consistorio expectantem, nam papa mihi dixerat ut interim quo isti possent venire ipse negocia aliqua expediret prout multa expedivit per horas duas et eo plus ibidem sedens, inter quas expeditiones card^{li} de Grassis fratri meo dedit monasterium de Strata Bononiensi valoris ducat. 800 vacans per privationem cardinalis Petrutii ac etiam ecclesiam et titulum s. Mariae Transtiberim cum domibus adiacentibus vacantibus per privationem cardinalis de Saulis ac etiam prioratum s. Bartholomaei de porta Bononiensi vacatem per obitum Iohannis de Gozadinis* pridie in gubernio Regiensi crudeliter interfecti. Cum autem nuntiatum fuisset generali s. Augustini ut ad papam veniret quia iam ipse esset creatus cardinalis recusavit venire timens ne fuisset illusus sicut in proximo consistorio fuerat, nam multi ad eum iverunt cum festivitate et gaudio nuntiantes quod esset cardinalis et iam ipse hilaritatem fecit etiam publicam cum risu populi de levitate tanta quia non fuit verum. Tandem cum ego alium atque alium nuntium misissem ut omnino veniret quia papa eum expectabat tandem venit cum iam novi alii omnes ingressi fuissent ad consistorium et papam et cardinales osculati fuissent. De generali autem minorum maior risus fuit, quia, cum ut dicitur ipse non quaesivisset hanc dignitatem sed omnino alienus esset quia per paucos dies antea fuerat creatus et electus generalis minorum, non volebat venire dicens nuntiis per me missis quod errarent et non intellexissent mandatum eis datum et similia, tandem cum alios atque alios destinassem ut omnino veniret venit quidem pedester cum zocculis cum vestitu satis vili et in omnibus se novum ostendit et cum ante me esset et peteret

* *Ms*: Bozadinis.

quid vellem manebat genuflexus ambobus genibus semper sic mecum loquens ita stupidus erat et in fine duxi eum ad papam qui iam consistorium exierat et eum papa osculatus est et cardinalem appellavit sicque ipse ad alios venit in camera cardinalis de Medicis expectantes horam cenae. Antequam autem cenarent papa dedit omnibus birreta rubea praeterquam tribus generalibus quibus dedit nigra et fecerunt omnes cenam cum papa in logia et habui birreta antiqua omnium sic mihi significante pontifice ut facerem. Prodigium magnum ea die supervenit: nam cum dies satis clara et serena esset, subito in turbidam tempestatem versa est et venti grandines et imbres densi fuerunt et fulgur maximum quod percussit turrim s. Mariae Traspontinae et abstulit Christum lapideum de gremio matris cuius imago erat supra portam ecclesiae ita ut ipsa matris imago remansit cum brachiis apertis quasi flens quod filium perdidit.

Die ven. IIIi iulii fuit publicum consistorium in aula solita ubi cardinales praedicti XXXI declarati et publicati fuerunt. The Pope: redete satis docte et bene more suo.

[Paris de Grassis, * *Diarium*, Rossiana Libr. Vienna, and
Sec. Arch. of the Vatican.]

32. CONSISTORY OF 1ST JULY, 1517.*

. . . Cum S. D. N. praeter cardinales in proximo consistorio designatos, pro quibus collegit vota, proposuisset rev. d. archiepisc. Consanum, episc. Comensem, generalem ordinis min. S. Francisci de observ. et prothonot. Pisanum addendos esse aliis cardinalibus iam designatis habuissetque vota rev. dominorum libera, Sua S^{tas} de consensu et consilio praefatorum domin. et auct. Dei omnipot., beat. apost. Petri et Pauli et sua creavit et assumpsit in S. R. E. presbiteros cardinales vid. . . .

[* *Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the
Vatican.*]

33. POPE LEO X. TO CARDINAL EGIDIO CANISIO.†

1517, Juli 1, Rom.

Dilecte etc. Hodie inducti probitate, prudentia, doctrina, rerum agendarum experientia, moribus probatis, religione et aliis

* See *supra*, p. 200.

† See *supra*, p. 205.

praestantibus virtutibus et meritis tuis te magnam gloriam ord. s. Augustini in numerum et portionem aliorum ven. fratrum nostrorum S. R. E. cardinalium vocavimus. Hopes he will be of service to the Holy See. Is to continue General of his order until the next Chapter.

Dat. Romae 1517 Julii 1, P. N. A. 5°.

[Cop. Cod. Asburnh. 287, Laurent. Library, Florence.]

34. CONSISTORY OF 10TH JULY, 1517.*

Romae die veneris 10 m. julii 1517. S. D. N. dixit quod rev. dom. cardinales seniores subscribere vellent bullam creationis dom. novorum cardinalium, in qua derogabatur capitulis conclavis si forsan in aliquo promotioni ultimo factae obstarent. Deinde S. S^{tas} instituit ecclesiam sive monasterium S. Mariae in Aracoeli in titulum presbyteralem. . . .

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

35. CONSISTORY OF 24TH JULY, 1517.†

Romae die veneris 24 m. julli 1517. S. D. N. restituit dom. Raphaelem Riarium ad dignitatem cardinalatus nec non ad officia et beneficia quae ante privationem habebat sine tamen praejudicio tituli mei S. Laurentii in Damaso et sine voce activa et passiva prout in capitulis desuper confectis plenius continetur pro quorum observatione collegium rev. dominorum promisit. Deinde Sua S^{tas} proposuit restitutionem dom. Bindinelli de Saulis eodem modo, et habuit vota rev^{morum} dominorum, tamen Sua S^{tas} eum tunc non restituit. . . .

[*Acta consist. vicecanc. in Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

36-37. THE PARDON OF RAFFAELLO RIARIO.‡

[In nomine] Domini. Amen. Infrascripta sunt capitula et promissiones S. D. N. facta per dom. Raphaelem de Riario, olim card^{lem} s^{ti} Georgii, et cautiones per eum datae, videlicet :

* See *supra*, p. 201.

† See *supra*, p. 190.

‡ See *supra*, pp. 182, 189.

In primis die septima julii 1517 certiorati per nos notarios etc. infrascripti fideiussores, quod dominus Raphael de Riario, olim card^{lis} S^u Georgii, in presentiarum in carceribus in castro S^u Angeli de Urbe detentus, pro eius liberatione et relaxatione a dicto castro inter alia tenetur dare idoneas et sufficientes cautiones pro summa 150,000 ducatorum auri de camera de non recedendo ab obedientia S. D. N. ullo unquam tempore et de non recedendo ex locis sibi assignandis per eundem S. D. N. in dominio temporali S. R. E. absque eius licentia in scriptis obtinenda et quod erit perpetuo bonus et fidelis servitor prefati S. D. N. et quod nunquam aliquid aget aut machinabitur seu machinari attentabit contra personam, dignitatem aut statum S^{us} sue et S. R. E. aut contra eiusdem S. D. N. consanguineos et affines et ill. Medicum familiam, prout latius et diffusius in capitulis inter ipsum d. R. ex una et S. D. N. initis seu eniendis [sic] continetur ad que relatio in omnibus et per omnia habeatur : hinc fuit et est, quod infrascripti fideiussores et eorum singuli precibus prefati d. R. scientes se non teneri etc. [sic] sponte etc. [sic] promiserunt et quilibet eorum promisit, quod prefatus d. R. promissa omnia et singula servabit et adimplebit sub infrascriptis penis et pecuniarum suumis per eos respective promissis, quas infrascripti fideiussores et eorum quilibet in casu contraventionis eo ipso incurrere voluerunt, obligando se quilibet in pleniori forma camerae cum constitutione procuratorum et aliis clausulis in similibus apponi solitis et consuetis latius extendendis ad sensum sapientis non mutata substantia veritatis.

In primis spectabiles viri Bernardinus Jannelli, Nichodemus Simi, Marchus Bronsini et Joh. Bapt. Petri de Caprarola procuratores et scindici [sic] communitatis et hominum dicte terre Caprarole, prout de mandato manu s[er] Tiberii Johannis de Caprarola notarii publici sub die sexta julii 1517 subscripto ac recognito et penes nos notarios dimisso plene constitit, nomine dicte communitatis pro summa 4000 ducatorum similium promiserunt, videlicet :

Spectabiles viri Hieronimus Bernardini Zucche et Johannes Rose de Capranica procuratores et scindici [sic] ac eo nomine communitatis et hominum dicte terre Capranice, prout de eorum mandato manu Dominici Angeli Antonii de Capranica sub die sexta julii 1517 subscripto et recognito plene constitit, pro

summa 4000 ducatorum similium nomine dicte communitatis Capranice promiserunt etc. presentibus dicto Rosello et Jac^o Ant^o de Rogeriis de Sutrio testibus etc.

Spectabiles viri d. Philippus de Lutiis, d. Jac. Ant. de Rogeriis et Franciscus Evangeliste [sic] cives Sutринi procuratores et scindici [sic] communitatis et hominum dicte civitatis Sutrii, prout de eorum procuratorum mandato manu Scipionis condam Jacobi de Sutrio publici notarii sub die sexta julii 1517 subscripto et recognito plene constitit, nomine dicte communitatis Sutrii promiserunt pro summa 10,000 ducatorum similium presentibus dicto Rosello et Hieronimo Zuccha supra dictis testibus etc.

D. Jacobus Ant. de Rogeriis de Sutrio ut principalis et privata persona promisit pro summa 4000 ducatorum similium.

D. Philippus de Lutiis de Sutrio ut principalis et privata persona promisit pro summa 4000 ducatorum similium.

D. Franc. de Agillaria civis Sutrinensis ut principalis et privata persona promisit pro summa 4000 ducatorum similium presentibus d. Rosello de Rosellis de civitate Castelli et Prospero de Sinibaldis ac Vincentio de Speronibus laico Immolensi testibus ad premissa etc.

D. Julius Matheus civis Romanus promisit pro summa 4000 ducat.

D. Domitius Cechinus civis Romanus promisit pro summa 1000 ducat.

D. Paulus Gallus civis Romanus promisit pro summa 1000 ducat.

D. Franc. de Spannochis civis Romanus promisit pro summa 2000 ducat.

D. Ricchardus Mazatoste civis Romanus pro summa 1000 ducat.

D. Stephanus de Capiteferreo civis Romanus promisit pro summa 2000 ducat.

D. Dominicus de Picchis civis Romanus pro summa 2000 duc.

D. Albertinus de Tibaldeschis " " 1000 "

D. Franc. de la Vetera " " 1000 "

D. Jo. Arcionus " " 2000 "

D. Dominicus de Cavalariis " " 2000 "

D. Franc. Brancha " " 2000 "

D. Franc. Blondus " " 4000 "

D. Palutius Matheus civis romanus promisit pro summa 2000 duc.

D. Stephanus de Theulis " " 1000 "

D. Laurentius Steph. de Valle " " 2000 "

D. Antonius Draco " " 2000 "

D. Antonius de Fregiapanibus " " 3000 "

D. Franc. de Fabiis " " 1000 "

D. Antonius de la Volta civis Bononiensis, pro summa 2000 "

D. Galeatius Poeta " " 3000 "

D. Matheus Gozadinus " " 3000 "

D. Gaspar Lupari " " 3000 "

D. Hieronimus de Crescentiis de Bononia " 2000 "

D. Carolus Gratus civis Bononiensis " 2000 "

D. Marchus Antonius Lupari de Bononia " 3000 "

D. Camillus de Leazariis scriptor apostolicus " 2000 "

D. Gregorius de Monte Calvello " 500 "

D. Alexander Gentilis medicine doctor " 500 "

D. Galienus Almadianus " 500 "

D. Petrus Perinus " 500 "

D. Aristophilus medicus " 500 "

D. Jo. Bap^{ta} de Spiritibus " 500 "

D. Neapolionus s[er] Angeli [sic] " 500 "

D. Antonius Boninsega " 500 "

D. Perotius Mostus " 500 "

D. Palinus [sic] Tignosinus " 500 "

Joh^{es} Cordella " 500 "

Dominicus Bosseus " 500 "

Dominicus Bonellus " 500 "

Nicolaus Nicolosinus " 500 "

Sebastianus Spreca " 500 "

Jo. Angelus de la Zeccha " 500 "

Franc. de Abisciolatis " 500 "

Marianus Bussa " 500 "

Petrus Cordella " 500 "

Omnes de Viterbio per D^{num} Rainerium Capocciam procuratorem eorum, prout de suo procurationis mandato manu Elisei Petrocchi notarii de Viterbio sub die . . . [sic] mensis julii 1517 subscripto et recognito plene constitit, respective promiserunt in totum constituen. summam 9500 ducatorum similium.

D. Rainerius Capoccia civis Viterbien. ut principalis et privata

persona promisit pro summa 500 duc. presentibus D. Rosello de Rosellis prefato et Prospero de Sinibaldis clerico Oximan. et Vincentio de Speronibus laico Immolensi testibus etc.

Die XII. dicti mensis.

D. Raphael Casalius civis Romanus promisit pro summa 3000 duc.

D. Virgilius de Cinciis civis Romanus pro summa 2000 duc.

D. Dominicus de Maximis " " 5000 "

D. Antonius de Fabiis " " 1000 "

D. Marianus de Astallis " " 1000 "

D. Hieronimus de Picchis " " 1000 "

D. Bap^{ta} Palinus " " 4000 "

D. Petrus Paulus Castellanus " " 2000 "

D. Marius Scappuccius medic. doct. " " 1000 "

D. Marchus de Cosciaris " " 3000 "

D. Alexander Miccinellus " " 1000 "

D. Marianus Castellanus " " 2000 "

D. Aloysius Mathutius " " 1000 "

D. Petrus Magdalenus " " 1000 "

D. Jacobus de Fregiapanibus " " 3000 "

D. Jo. Bap^{ta} de Theodorici phisicus " " 1000 "

D. Honofrius de Fabiis " " 2000 "

D. Franc. Thomasius civis Romanus pro summa 2000 duc. presentibus D^{no} Philippo Attono et Benedicto de Ballis laico Bononiensi testibus ad premissa vocatis et requisitis.

Die XIII. julii 1517.

D. Franc. de Lenis civis Romanus pro summa 1000 duc.

D. Marius de Carronibus " " 2000 "

D. Hieronimus Salamonus " " 1000 "

D. Andreas Carosius " " 1000 "

D. Jo. Petrus Cafarellus " " 4000 "

D. Fabius de Montebono " " 1000 "

D. Georgius de Sancta Cruce civis Romanus pro summa 4000 duc. presentibus supra proxime testibus.

Die XIII. julii 1517.

D. Petrus Antonius Mathei civis Romanus pro summa 2000 duc.

D. Cyriachus Matheus civis Romanus pro summa 1000 duc. et R^{ti} patres Dⁿⁱ Cesar de Riario patriarcha Alexandrinus et Augustinus Spinola episcopus Perusinus prefatos Petrum Ant^m et Ciriachum indemnes relevare promiserunt, iurarunt etc. presentibus D. Benedicto de Ballis civi Bononien. et Ugone Antonii clerico Lugdunensi testibus.

D. Marchus magistri Simonis civis Romanus pro summa 2000 duc. presentibus quibus supra.

Die XV. dicti.

R^{ti} patres domini Cesar Riarius patriarcha Alexandrinus, Octavianus episcopus Viterbiensis, Gisbertus episcopus Rapolanus, Ant. Jacobus episcopus Camerinensis, Augustinus episcopus Perusinus, Altobellus episcopus Polen., Jo. Bap^{ta} episcopus Sulmonensis, Hieronimus episcopus Aretinus, Thomas episcopus Saonensis, Jo. Bap^{ta} episcopus Auximanens., Franciscus Spinola prothonotarius apostolicus, Petrus Paulus episcopus Esinus certiorati per nos notarios etc. de obligationibus et fideiussionibus predictis pro summa 150,000 ducatorum sic ut premittitur respective dat. sponte etc. approbarunt dictos fideiussores in forma sub penis camere se obligantes iurarunt etc. presentibus D. Paulo Blondo cive Romano et D. Bernardino de Contreras scriptore apostolico testibus etc.

Die XI. dicti.

Certiorati per nos notarios etc. infrascripti officiales promissores, quod D. R. de Riario olim card^{lis} S^{ti} Georgii ad presens in carceribus in castro S^{ti} Angeli de Urbe detemptus pro eius ex dicto castro relaxatione et liberatione tenetur dare idoneas fideiussiones pro summa et quantitate 50,000 ducatorum auri in auro de camera solvend. S. D. N. in festo omnium sanctorum proxime futuro cum certis pactis et conditionibus in supra nominatis capitulis latius expressis ad que fideiussores infrascripti relationem habere voluerunt : hinc est quod infrascripti fideiussores et promissores ad preces prefati D. R. scientes etc. sponte etc. promiserunt et quilibet eorum promisit pro infrascriptis pecuniarum summis inferius annotatis solvendis in festo omnium sanctorum proxime futuro eidem S. D. N., ut prefertur, pro quibus observandis se in pleniori forma camere obligarunt et quilibet eorum respective se obligavit cum clausulis consuetis et constituendo

eorum procuratores irrevocabiles ad resignandum infrascripta eorum officia respective in illius favorem in cuius S. D. N. videbitur et placebit in eventum non solutionis infrascripte summe per eos respective promisse iurarunt etc.

D. Federicus Flavius Fulginas, scriptor archivii Rom. curiae, promisit et se ut supra obligavit pro summa 500 duc. non tamen cum constitutione procuratoris ad resignandum etc.

D. Ferdinandus de Acre scriptor brevium pro summa 500 duc.

D. Antonius Venantius S. D. N. accolitus „ 500 „

D. Petrus Franc. de Costa S. D. N. scutifer et natus sexdecim annorum vel circa ac renuncians beneficio minoris etatis cum assensu et presentia D. Petri de Costa eius patris pro summa 500 duc.

R^{duc} pater D. Honofrius de Ursinis prothonot. et secretarius apostolicus pro summa 2000 duc.

D. Julius de Narnia camere apostolice notarius pro summa 500 duc.

D. Donatus camere apostolice notarius pro summa 500 duc. presentibus Dⁿis Philippo Attono et Bened. de Ballis Bononien. testibus etc.

Die XII. dicti mensis.

D. Joh. Sances scriptor apostolicus et cubicularius apostolicus pro summa 1000 duc. non tamen cum constitutione procuratoris ad resignandum.

D. Anthonius de Alexiis de Narnia not^s auditoris camere pro summa 500 duc. non tamen cum constitutione procuratoris ad resignandum etc., quem R^{duc} pater D. Franc. Spinola indemnem relevare promisit et iuravit.

D. Berengarius Serra scriptor archivii et cubicularius apostolicus pro summa 1000 duc.

D. Camillus de Leazariis scriptor apostolicus et scutifer, portionarius et presidens annone pro summa 1000 duc.

D. Julianus Cecius scriptor archivii et litterarum apostolicarum sollicitator pro summa 500 duc.

D. Hieronimus de Urigiis de Trevio collector plumbi pro summa 500 duc.

D. Gabriel Minutulus scriptor brevium pro summa 500 duc.

D. Matheus Bongianus turris Nove soldanus et D. Thomas eius frater presidens annone promiserunt . . . pro summa 1000 duc.

D. Raimundus de Capiteferreo scriptor achivii et scutifer
S. D. N. pro summa 500 duc.

D. Jo. Petrus de Cingulo procurator penitentie pro summa
500 duc.

D. Jacobus Simoncinus serviens armor. pro summa 500 duc.

D. Franciscus Carretta serviens armorum „ 500 „

D. Perseus Bucchanus cam. apost. notar. „ 1000 „

D. Michael Mieres portionarius ripe „ 250 „

D. Lucentius de Cosciaris subdiac^s apost. „ 1000 „

D. Guillelmus Beltrandi abbreviator de minori „ 1000 „

D. Franc. Palavicinus notarius rote „ 500 „

D. Petrus Paulus Vecchia scriptor archivii et presidens ripe pro
summa 500 duc. non tamen cum constit^{ne} procurat^{is} ad resignan.

Here follow other sums remaining over from officials of like
standing: 500 duc., 500 duc., 750 duc., 500 duc., 1000 duc.,
1000 duc., 500 duc.

Die XIII. dicti mensis julii.

500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc. (Benedictus de Costa
scriptor brevium natus XII. [sic] annorum cum consensu patru),
500 duc., 500 duc., 1000 duc.

Die XII. julii.

250 duc., 250 duc. (Hercules Cantacusinus litt. apost.
sollicitator), 500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc., 1000 duc., 500 duc.,
500 duc., 1000 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc.,
500 duc., 500 duc., 1000 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc., 500 duc.,
D. Jo. Bap^{ta} de Saldonibus scutifer . . . pro summa 1000 duc.
et D. Cesar patriarcha Alex. et Augustinus Spinola eundem
. . . indemnem relevare promiserunt. . . . [In margine
sinistra:] Die 28. novembr. 1517 D. Rogerius Saldonus sollicitator
promisit pro suprascripto Jo. Bap^{ta} fratre suo solvere duc. 400 in
festo resurrectionis . . . [In margine dextra:] Die 13. octobr.
1517 D. Didacus de Acre scriptor archivii promisit pro 300 duc.
pro inscripto Jo. Bap^{ta} Saldono. . . .

Die XIV. dicti mensis.

R^{mus} pater Nicolaus de Capranica episcopus Neocastrensis
secretarius apost. pro summa 2000 duc. [the patriarch of Alexandria
and Augustinus Spinola episc. Perusinus again stood surety for

him]. Paulus Blondus secret. apost. pro summa 1000 duc., another 1000 duc., another 500 duc. D. Petrus Coptius de Narnia scriptor registri bullarum pro summa 500 duc., another 250 duc., another 500 duc., another 500 duc., another 500 duc., another 1000 duc., another 500 duc., another 500 duc., another 500 duc., another 750 duc., another 500 duc.

Die XV. dicti.

Another 2000 duc., another 500 duc., another 1000 duc., another 1000 duc.

Dicta die.

Constitutus coram nobis notariis etc. D^{nus} Raphael de Riario olim card^{lis} s^{ti} Georgii citra etc. constituit suos veros legitimos et indubitatos procuratores etc. r^{dos} patres d^{nos} Cesarem de Riario patriarcham Alexandrinum absentem etc., Altobellum episcopum Polensem presentem etc. et quemlibet eorum in solidum specialiter et expresse ad ipsius constituentis nomine et pro eo requirendum et rogandum r^{dos} dom. cardinales in capitulis nominatos ut ipsi cardinales pro se ipsis promittant et iurent prout latius in capitulo continetur. Necnon ad requirendum et rogandum magnificos principum oratores in capitulis etiam nominatos, quod oratores ipsi promittant verbis et vice principum suorum, quod D^{nus} R. constituens servabit promissa et quod dicti oratores respective curabunt apud principes suos omni studio, opera et diligentia, quod promittent, approbabunt et ratificabunt prout latius in dictis capitulis continetur, ad que dictus constituens relationem haberi voluit et mandavit promittens de rato et cum clausulis consuetis iuravit etc. presentibus Rome in castro S^{ti} Angeli D^{no} Dominico Colecta canonico Senen. et Ugulino Tesco canonico Urbevetan. testibus etc.

Dicta die.

Consequenter dicti D. Cesar et Altobellus procuratores personaliter in nostri presentia etc. pro executione premissorum adiverunt ill^m D^{num} Comitem Albertum de Carpo Cesaree Maiestatis oratorem, quem personaliter in eius domo repertum nomine dicti Dⁿⁱ R. constituentis requisiverunt, ut contentaretur promittere S. D. N. verbis et vice Cesaree M^{ties}, quod prefatus R. constituens servabit promissa per eum S. D. N. facta et quod

dicta Cesarea M^{tas} infra quadrimestre hoc idem ratificet etc. Qui D^{nus} Albertus orator sic ut premittitur requisitus nomine sui principis promisit S. D. N. et nobis notariis etc. . . . Rome in domo solite habitationis dom. Jo. Ant^o Austone Carpen. nullius dioc. et Angelo Saccazino laico Carpen. testibus etc.

Die XVI. julii.

Dicti procuratores . . . adiverunt r^{dum} patrem D. Petrum de Orrea episcopum Siracusanum oratorem Catholici regis Hispaniarum, quem similiter requisiverunt ut supra etc. Qui . . . promisit . . . hac tamen conditione adiecta, quod dom. Hieronimus Vich collega suus ratificet suam huiusmodi promissionem . . . presentibus D^{no} Laurentio . . . [sic] prothonotario Licien. et Paulo Blondo testibus etc.

Successive . . . adiverunt d^m Hieronimum Vich, qui . . . ratificavit et approbavit . . .

Eadem die.

Deinde . . . adiverunt . . . mag^{cum} D^m N. [sic] oratorem regis Portugallie . . . Qui promisit . . . [similar].

Dicta die.

Postremo . . . adiverunt . . . r^{dum} patrem D. N. [sic] epis. copum Vigornien. oratorem seren^{mi} regis Angeli . . . [similar].

Dicta die.

Dicti procuratores adiverunt . . . r^{dum} card^{lem} Surrentinum qui . . . promisit prout in dicto capitulo continetur cum conditione, quod hoc idem alii cardinales promittant.

Dicta die.

Adiverunt rev. dom. cardinalem de Flisco . . . , card^{lem} s^{te} crucis . . . , card^{lem} de Medicis . . . , card^{le} Cibo . . . , card^{lem} sanctorum quattuor . . . , card^{lem} Anthonitan. . . . , card^{lem} Grimanum . . . , card^{lem} de Grassis . . . , card^{lem} Agennen.

Infrascripta sunt capitula et conventiones ineundae inter S. D. N. et d^{num} Raphaelem de Riario olim card^{lem} Sⁱ Georgii, quorum tenor sequitur et est talis.

Licet nuper tam ex propriis confessionibus Raphaelis de Riario

presbyteri Saonen. tunc episcopi Ostien. card^{lis} s^{ti} Georgii quam etiam ex aliis legitimis probationibus et processu contra eum factis et formatis plene constiterit per eum nonnulla excessus et crimina privatione digna perpetrata fuisse ac S. D. N. Leo divina providentia papa decimus in suo concistorio secreto (ut moris est) eundem R. per suam diffinitivam sententiam de fratrum consilio et assensu latam dignitate, honore, auctoritate et galero cardineo ac titulo, insigniis et privilegiis voceque activa et passiva omnibusque et singulis cathedralibus quibus preerat et aliis monasteriis dignitatibus etiam episcopalibus officiisque et beneficiis ecclesiasticis, que in titulum vel commendam seu quovis alio modo obtinebat, privaverit et deposuerit ac privatum et depositum declaraverit, sibi que ne de cetero S^{te} R. E. cardinalem se nominaret, gereret, scriberet et reputaret ac omnibus Christifidelibus ne eundem R. pro cardinale nominarent, tenerent, tractarent vel reputarent, inhibuerit: tamen S^{tas} Sua illum volens imitari, cuius vices gerit in terris et cuius proprium est misereri semper et parcere quique brachiis suis apertis omnibus se paratum ostendit ad recipiendum peccatores veniam suppliciter implorantes, animum suum ad parcendum eidem R. clementem et misericordem prebuit cum infrascriptis tamen conditionibus, videlicet:

Quod ipse R. teneatur fateri prout fatetur, quod infrascriptam restitutionem et rehabilitationem ex mera Sanctitatis Sue gratia et clementia obtinet, cum merito propter eius demerita erga S^{tem} Suam fuisset privatus, ac etiam fateri eandem S^{tem} Suam erga eum maxima clementia usum fuisse, et propterea promittere prout promisit et promittit, quod quamdiu ipse R. vixerit fidelis et prudens erit servus erga S^{tem} Suam et pro ea semper Deum rogabit nec unquam de cetero non solum aget, sed nec etiam cogitabit aut machinabitur adversus eam aut eius consanguineos et affines ac ill^{mam} Medicum familiam nec etiam ipse R. per se vel alium seu alios nuntios seu litteras aget aut tractabit quicquam cum aliquo principe Christiano, communitate et dominio, cardinali seu cardinalibus aut aliis prelatiis nisi de rebus suis propriis privatis domesticis et familiaribus.

Item quod ipse R. eidem Sanctitati Suae summam 150,000 ducatorum auri de camera in tribus terminis solvere teneatur et obligatus sit et ad id se efficaciter obliget et de illis in dictis terminis solvendis idoneas cautiones partim per bancharios partim

vero per officiales Rom. curiae prebeat ac dare et prebere promittat, quorum singulorum officia duplum saltem valeant eius quod quilibet eorum promittet. Et primo pro primis 50,000 ducatis teneatur facere, quod dom. Augustinus Ghisius bancharius confiteatur habere illos in depositum ad instantiam dicte Sanctitatis Sue per eum eidem solvend. prout infra dicetur.

Item quod ipse R. antequam liberetur a carceribus et libertati restituatur, teneatur et debeat dare securitatem partim banchariorum idoneorum et probatorum, partim vero officialium Rom. cu[rie] idoneorum, qui promittant eidem S. D. N. solvere dictos alios 50,000 ducatos in proxima futura celebritate omnium Sanctorum ipsique officiales ultra medietatem valoris officiorum promittere non possint ut preferitur.

Item quod teneatur dare cautionem idoneam de solvendis dictis reliquis 50,000 ducatis in festo resurrectionis dom. nostri Jesu Christi proxime futuro etiam partim per bancharios, partim per officiales Rom. curiae, quorum singuli promittere non possint ultra medietatem valoris officiorum que obtinent, et si contingeret aliquem officialem ex officialibus expromissoribus datis decedere, tunc loco decedentis huiusmodi teneatur dare alium eque idoneum, qui surrogetur loco defuncti, ipsique officiales sic dati teneantur constituere procuratorem inrevocabilem ad vendendum officia pro satisfactione summe per eum promisse in eventum in quem summam per eos promissam non solverent aut solvi facerent, et ex pretio officii tunc venditi summa promissa eidem Sanctitati Sue persolvatur, residuum pretii predicto officiali cuius officium erat dari debeat.

Item quod ipse R. teneatur dare bonas sufficientes et idoneas cautiones pro summa et quantitate 150,000 ducatorum de non recedendo ullo unquam tempore ab obedientia S^{ti} Suae et de non recedendo de locis assignandis per eandem Sanctitatem Suam in dominio temporali ecclesie absque eius expresso mandato et licentia in scriptis prestando. Et quod perpetuo erit bonus et perpetuus servitor S^{mi} D. N. pape itaque nihil unquam agat aut machinabitur sive machinari attemptabit contra personam, dignitatem aut statum Sanctitatis Sue aut S^{te} Rom. Ecclesie nec ulla in re contraveniet voluntati Sue Beatitudinis, sed in omnibus morem geret et obediet ei ut bonum et devotum servitorem decet in quocunque statu et dignitate fuerit ac cum esse contigerit.

Item quod dictus R. teneatur facere quod sacrum collegium cardinalium videlicet cardinalis sancte Crucis, Grimanus, Surrentinus, Fliscus, Monte, Anthonitanus, Grassis, sanctorum quattuor, Farnesius, Cornelius, Medices, Cibo, qui interfuerunt sententie privationis, et cardinalis Agennensis, qui tunc presens non fuit, promittant ad eius preces, quod ipse R. servabit omnia supradicta et in eventum in quem illis seu alicui ex eis contraverit quod habebunt eum semper pro privato et ligato omnibus censuris et penis in dicta sententia contentis, et eum ut talem donec vixerint evitabunt et quantum in eis erit persequentur et sententiam predictam ad unguem servabunt et ita illam servare iurabunt et ad id proprio iuramento se astringent nec illius relaxationem inpetrabunt nec illa ab aliis pro eis impetrata utentur seu alias uti promittent [sic ; = permittent?] publice et secrete ac in communi et nominibus propriis ut singuli promittent quod ipse R. omnia et singula supradicta pure, simpliciter ac libere observabit.

Item quod dictus R. teneatur facere et curare cum effectu quod oratores principum Maximiliani in Imperatorem electi, Francorum Christianissimi et Caroli Hispaniarum Catholici et Henrici Anglie ac Portugallie et Algarbiorum regum ill^{ium} et dominii Venetorum promittant verbis et vice principum suorum, quod ipse R. omnia et singula supradicta pure, simpliciter et libere servabit et casu quo non servaret quod ipsi principes eum in regnis et dominiis suis non recipient, sed potius rejicient, persequentur et capient et incarcerabunt et alia facient prout idem S. D. N. eis mandabit, habendo ipsum R. in eum locum in quem S^{tas} Sua habendum esse declarabit, et preter hoc idem R. statim et eo ipso absque alia citatione et declaratione desuper fienda reincidet in omnes et singulas penas ac censuras alias in dicta sententia privationis contra eum concistorialiter lata contentas. Et quod ipsi principes extunc de cetero eundem R. pro cardinali non nominabunt nec tenebunt, tractabunt vel reputabunt, sed pro privato et omnibus censuris et penis in sententia privationis contentis ligatum quoad vixerit habebunt et eum evitabunt et quantum in eis erit persequentur et sententiam privationis ad unguem servabunt nec in eventum contraventionis huiusmodi eidem S^{ti} Sue et successoribus suis pro eo super predictis supplicabunt. Et quod ipsi principes infra quatuor menses proxime futuros expresse ratificabunt

dictum capitulum in eorum literis vel instrumentis desuper conficiendis inserendum.

Item quod promicent nomine quo supra prefati oratores, quod prefati principes sui non instabunt apud Sanctitatem Suam pro obtinenda uberiori gratia tam de persona quam de aliis rebus ipsius R., quam in presentibus capitulis continetur.

Item quod si super contraventione et aliis in supradictis capitulis contentis oriretur aliqua dubitatio seu disceptatio, stare debeat libere declarationi et dicto extraiudiciali eiusdem S. D. N. quibuscunque exceptionibus, allegationibus et oppositionibus ex quacunque causa et grandi et inexcogitata consideratione tam iuris quam facti et alias quomodolibet nequaquam obstantibus.

Die XVII. mensis julii MDXVII.

Constitutus coram nobis etc. d^{nus} R. de Riario olim card^{lis} Sⁱ Georgii presens sponte etc. visis prius dictis capitulis et eis per nos notarios sibi intelligibiliter lectis, fassus est, promisit ac teneri voluit respective in omnibus et per omnia prout supra in dictis capitulis continetur, pro quibus firmiter observandis et adimplendis se in pleniori forma camere obligavit cum clausulis solitis et consuetis in instrumentis in forma camere apponi solitis et consuetis, dans et concedens nobis notariis infra-scriptis licentiam et facultatem extendendi presentem promissionem et obligationem in pleniori et ampliori forma ad sensum sapientis totiens quotiens ante vel post publicationem instrumenti non mutata substantia veritatis, ita quod omnino subsistat iuravit corporaliter tactis scripturis. Presente dom. Mario de Peruschis procuratore phiscali pro dicto S. D. N. recipiente. Acta fuerunt hec Rome in castro Sⁱ Angeli in sala magna presentibus ibidem d^{no} Dominico Colecta canonico Senen., Ugolino Theseo canonico Urbevetano ac Anselmo Thome clerico Narnien. et Ludovico Caramelli de Riconisio clerico Taurinen., testibus etc. Infra-scripte sunt gratie impetrande per dom. Raphaellem de Riario a S^{mo} D. N. papa.

Sanct^{mus} autem D. N. ex sua liberalitate primo erit contentus promittere non levare depositum 50.000 ducatorum penes dictum dom. Augustinum ad instantiam Sue Sanctitatis existens, nisi postquam S^{us} Sua restituerit eundem R. ad pristinam famam, honorem, dignitatem et libertatem ac officia etiam cardinalatus preter tamen

vocem activam et passivam tam in electione Romani pontificis quam in aliis rebus in quibus cardinales votum prestare debent aut soliti sunt, quibus eadem S^{tas} eundem R. carere vult et intendit, donec et quousque aliud clementie sue visum fuerit et placebit, et beneficia, indulta, pensiones et fructuum ecclesiasticorum loco pensionis reservationes et alias ad eum statum in quo erat ante privationem in omnibus et per omnia ac si dicta privatio subsequuta non esset et prout in litteris apostolicis desuper conficiendis latius exprimetur, quas idem R. infra mensem expedire teneatur et si per eum steterit, quominus illas infra dictum mensem expediet, extunc liceat eidem S^{ti} Sue dictum depositum libere petere et recipere.

Item quod eadem S^{tas} Sua debeat eidem R. concedere, quod possit transferre in quasunque personas omnes et singulas pensiones ac fructuum reservationes super quibusvis cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis, monasteriis et quibusvis aliis beneficiis ecc^{cis} alias apostolica sibi auctoritate assignatis in totum vel in partem etiam si in illarum reservatione non fuisset sibi concessa facultas illas transferendi, dummodo illi, qui pensiones seu fructus huiusmodi eidem R. solvere tenentur, fuerint pro parte dicti R. requisiti et ipsi noluerint pensiones seu reservationes fructuum huiusmodi extinguere, quodque possit ipse R. regimini et administrationi ecclesiarum ac illarum et monasteriorum ac quorumcunque beneficiorum ecc^{corum} cuiuscunque qualitatis fuerint commendis in favorem quarumcunque personarum per eundem R. nominandarum cedere ac S^{tas} Sua cessiones huiusmodi admittere et de personis per ipsum R. nominatis ecclesiis et monasteriis huiusmodi providere aut illa et alia beneficia huiusmodi personis nominatis conferre seu commendare debeat ipseque R. a personis, de quibus ecclesiis et monasteriis huiusmodi provisum fuerit seu quibus illa collata seu commendata fuerint, fructus ecclesiarum et monasteriorum et beneficiorum fructus huiusmodi personis, cum quibus conditionem suam poterit efficere meliorem, ad affirmam seu, annuam pensionem seu prestationem locare et ab eisdem personis anticipata solutione non tamen ultra sex annos recipere seu etiam fateri illos recepisse et ad standum locationi et solutionis anticipationi huiusmodi se et suos successores obligand., prout inter ipsum R. et illos quibus fructus predictos anticipata solutione locaverit

conventum et concordatum fuerit, libere et licite valeat absque labe simonie.

Item quod prefatus S^{mus} D. N. concedat eidem R., quod possit omnibus regressibus et accessibus ac indultis uti, que ante privationem huiusmodi sibi concessa fuerant et quibus ante dictam privationem uti poterat, preter vocem tamen activam et passivam tam in electione Romani pontificis quam in aliis rebus, quibus eadem S^{tas} Sua eundem R. carere vult et intendit, prout in litteris restitutionis desuper expediendis latius explicabitur.

Item quod S^{tas} Sua debeat dare super omnibus premissis et eorum singulis signaturas oportunas et necessarias cum clausulis et derogationibus opportunis et necessariis.

Item quod S^{tas} Sua debeat ad omnem liberam requisitionem et voluntatem dicti R. et agentium pro eo premissa exequi, dummodo ipse antequam liberetur de dicto castro S^{ti} Angeli infra memsem a die presentis stipulationis et contractus computandum premissa omnia et singula adimpleat presertim quod prestet dictas cautiones de solvendo 50,000 ducatorum in celebratione omnium Sanctorum et alia 50,000 in festo resurrectionis huiusmodi.

[Fol. 163 f:] Die XVII. julii 1517.

[In margine:] Constitutio procuratoris. [Then half a page is left blank.] In the middle of the page: Die XXIII. julii 1517. R^{mi} Dⁿⁱ A. tituli S^{te} Praxedis presbyter card^{lis} et N. card^{lis} Cornelius certificati per nos de contentis in dictis capitulis promiserunt et iurarunt prout in dictis capitulis, presentibus in concistorio d^{no} Philippo Adimaro et Andrea de Albizzis S^{mi} Dⁿⁱ N^{ri} camerariis.

Dicta die.

R^{mi} dⁿⁱ card^{les} omnes coram S^{mo} D. N. in concistorio collegialiter congregati promiserunt illud iddem et iurarunt, quod singulariter in eorum domibus promiserant et iuraverant. Promiserunt insuper et iurarunt quod dictus R. de Riario non discedet ex palatio apostolico sine expressa licentia et mandato S^{mi} D. N^{ri} presentibus quibus supra proxime.

Die XXIII. julii 1517.

Constitutus coram nobis notariis infrascriptis etc. r^{mus} pater dom. Cesar de Riario patriarcha Alexandrin., Augustinus Spinola

episcopus Perusin., Octavianus episcopus Viterbien., Petrus Paulus episcopus Exinus [sic], Antonius Jacobus episcopus Camerinen., Thomas episcopus Saonen., Galeatius de Riario, Isbertus episcopus Rapollanus, Hieronimus Piccholomineus episcopus Ilcinen., Altobellus episcopus Polen., Hieronimus episcopus Aretin., Gabriel episcopus Calven., Franciscus Spinola prothonotarius apostolicus et Jo. Bap^{ta} episcopus Ausiman. sponte promiserunt et quilibet eorum promisit S^{mo} D. N. et nobis notariis etc. d^{no} Mario de Peruschis procuratore phiscali presente et pro dicto S^{mo} D. N. recipiente, quod d^{nus} R. de Riario prefatus non discedet ex palatio apostolico hic in Urbe existenti sine expresso consensu licentia et mandato S^{mi} Dⁿⁱ N^{ri} sub infrascriptis penis et pecuniarum summis per eos respective promissis eo ipso in casu contraventionis per eos respective incurren., obligantes se in pleniori forma camere iurarunt etc. presentibus Rome in palatio apostolico d^{no} Bernardo Cardulo canonico Narnien. et Paulo de Corradinis cubiculariis apostolicis testibus etc.

D ^{nus} Cesar patriarcha	pro summa 10,000 duc.
Augustinus episcopus Perusin.	„ 10,000 „
Octavianus „ Viterbien.	„ 10,000 „
Petrus Paulus „ Esinus	„ 5,000 „
Ant. Jacobus „ Camerinen.	„ 5,000 „
Thomas „ Saonen.	„ 5,000 „
Galeatius de Riario	„ 5,000 „
Isbertus episcopus Rapollan.	„ 5,000 „
Hieronimus „ Ilcinen.	„ 5,000 „
Altobellus „ Polen.	„ 10,000 „
Hieronimus „ Aretin.	„ 5,000 „
Gabriel „ Calven.	„ 5,000 „
Franc. Spinola prothonotarius	„ 10,000 „
Jo. Bap ^{ta} episcopus Ausiman.	„ 5,000 „

Die XXX. julii 1517.

R^{dus} pater d^{nus} Cesar patriarcha Alexandrinus procurator et eo [sic] nomine r^{mi} dⁿⁱ Raphaelis episcopi Ostiensis card^{lis} adivit mag^{cum} virum d. Marchum Mumium oratorem ill^{mi} dominii Venetorum, quem personaliter in domo eius solite habitationis repertum nomine quo supra instantissime requisivit, ut contentaretur promittere S^{mo} D. N. et nobis notariis etc. verbis et

vice ill^{mi} dominii Venetorum, quod prefatus r^{mus} dom. R. Cardinalis servabit promissa per eum S^{mo} D. N. facta et quod idem dominium hoc idem infra quadrimestre ratificabit etc.

Qui d^{mus} Marchus orator sic ut premittitur requisitus promisit . . . presentibus d^{no} Hieronimo Dado dicti oratoris secretario et d^{no} Fabiano Vigili archipresbytero Spoletano testibus etc.

Dicta die.

Similar to above : . . . r^{dum} patrem d^{num} Dionisium episcopum Maclovien. et mag^{cum} virum d^{num} Matheum de Villabram oratores Christianissimi regis Francorum, quos in domo eorum solite habitationis ut supra similiter requisivit . . . promisit nomine Christianissimi regis [similar to above].

Die XV. septembris 1517 exhibita et presentata fuit pro parte supradicti r^{mi} d. card^{lis} ratificatio seu ratificationis instrumentum christianissimi regis Francorum tenoris subsequentis videlicet :

Franciscus Dei gratia Francorum rex, Mediolani dux et Genue dominus universis presentes litteras visuris notum facimus et nos debite certiorati de clementia, misericordia ac gratia, qua summus pontifex Leo decimus usus est in cardinales s^{ti} Georgii et de Sauli cum certis restrictionibus et limitationibus . . . Cum vero Dionisius episcopus Maclovien. et Mace [sic] de Villebresine oratores nostri apud sedem apostolicam ad dictorum cardinalium instantiam superius dicta promiserint, nos igitur, Summo Pontifici necnon dictis cardinalibus morem gerere cupientes, rata firma et grata que per dictos oratores nostros facta extitere habemus illaque observare promictimus et pollicemur. In cuius rei testimonium has presentes manu nostra subsignavimus et sigillo nostro muniri iussimus. Dat. Rothomagi die XVI. mensis augusti anno dⁿⁱ 1517 et regni nostri 3^o. . . . Francois.

Die XV. sept. 1517.

Exhibita et presentata fuit pro parte supradicti r^{mi} dⁿⁱ cardinalis infrascripta ratificatio seu instrumentum ratific^{nis} et promissionis ill^{mi} dominii Venetorum tenoris infrascripti : Leonardus Lauredanus Dei gratia dux Venetiarum etc. . . . laudamus, approbamus et ratificamus. . . . Datum in nostro ducali palatio die XXII. augusti 1517. . . .

There follows in Spanish the ratification of the kings of

Castille, Aragon, Sicily, etc. . . . d. d. En Medianburch a
XXVIII. dias del mes de Agosto 1517.

[Cop. (?) Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Arm. IV, caps. III,
f. 152-165^b.]

38. POPE LEO X. RESTORES CARDINAL RAFFAELLO RIARIO
TO HIS DIGNITIES.*

1517, Juli 24, Rom.

Leo etc. Ad fut. rei mem. Precellens auctoritas . . . Sane cum nuper ven^{lem} fratrem Raphaellem de Riario episcopum Ostien. camerarium nostrum S. R. Ecclesie cardlem s^{ti} Georgii nuncupatum propter crimen lese maiestatis per eum in personam nostram commissum per nostram diffinitivam sententiam de fratrum nostrorum consilio et assensu latam dignitate honore auctoritate et galero et card^{lis} S. R. E. ac titulis insigniis privilegiis et voce activa et passiva necnon omnibus ordinibus ac metrop^{nis} et cath^{bus} quibus preerat aliisque ecclesiis titulis et monasteriis dignitatibus et aliis beneficiis ecclesiasticis quibuscunque que in titulum vel commendam aut administrationem seu quovis alio modo obtinebat necnon quibusvis fructibus redditibus et proventibus ecclesiasticis etiam loco pensionum annuarum ac pensionibus annuis super similibus fructibus sibi reservatis apostolica auctoritate privavimus et deposuimus ac privatum et depositum declaravimus sibi ne de cetero pro s^{te} R. Ecclesie card^{li} se nominaret gereret scriberet et reputaret ac omnibus Christifidelibus ne eundem Raphaellem pro card^{li} nominarent tenerent tractarent vel reputarent inhibuimus, ac ipsum Raphaellem degradavimus et curie seculari tradi mandavimus, nosque postmodum volentes imitari vestigia illius cuius vicem in terris gerimus, qui pro persecutoribus suis cravit ad patrem, ac bonum pro malo retribuere, deliberavimus cum eodem Raphaelle uti misericordia et clementia, habita super hiis cum fratribus nostris deliberatione matura de eorundem fratrum consilio ac de apostolice potestatis plenitudine eundem Raphaellem card^{lem} iuxta tamen nonnulla capitula conventiones et conditiones inter nos et eundem Raphaellem card^{lem} nuper inita et firmata et in quodam instrumento publico per duos

* See *supra*, p. 190; at the beginning of this document, on the margin is written "Bembus."

camere apostolice notarios videl. dilectos filios Donatum Vulturanum et Julium de [Lücke in text] rogato contenta, quibus nullo pacto preiudicare intendimus, quinimo ea omnia prout conventa fuerunt inviolabiliter observari debere decernimus, in nostram et apostolice sedis gratiam recipimus et ad honorem famam card^{lis} dignitatem pileum ac omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratus ordines ac munus consecrationis et usum pallii quo ratione ecclesie Ostien. uti potest necnon camerariatus nostri officium ac Ostien. Conchen. Lucan. et alias cath^{les} etiam metrop^{nas} ecclesias nennon monasteria etiam consistorialia titulos ac beneficia et officia ecclesiastica cum cura et sine cura secularia et quorumvis ordinum regularia cuiuscunque qualitatis, etiam si de iure patronatus laicorum etiam nobilium et alias qualificatorum existerent, et ad illorum possessionem necnon regressus accessus ingressus facultates ac fructuum reservationes et alias pensiones ac iura privilegia et indulta et alias gratias et concessionem ac facultates etiam testandi necnon beneficia ecclesiastica conferendi . . . et bona mobilia et immobilia eidem Raphaeli card^{li} ante huiusmodi privationem quomodocunque debita et pertinentia necnon in pristinum . . . statum preterquam titulum s^{ti} Laurentii in Damaso ac vocem activam et passivam tam in electione Rom. Pontificis quam aliis actibus . . . , decernentes nihilominus quamcunque electionem tam activam quam passivam, quam de persona ipsius Raphaelis card^{lis} pro tempore forsitan quomodolibet fieri contingeret, nullam invalidam irritam it inanem ac nullius roboris vel momenti existere necnon presentes litteras quoad hoc vim specialis et perpetue constitutionis habere donec aliud a nobis quoad huiusmodi vocis prestationem decretum fuerit, auctoritate apostolica tenore presentium restituimus et plenarie reintegramus. . . . Quocirca ven^{lus} fratribus nostris Arminen. et Asculan. ac Spoletan. episcopis per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus ipsi vel quo aut unus eorum per se vel alium seu alios presentes litteras et in eis contenta quecunque ubi et quando opus fuerit ac quotiens pro parte dicti Raphaelis card^{lis} super hoc fuerint requisiti solemniter publicantes eique in premissis efficacis deffensionis presidio assistentes faciant eum restitutione repositione reintegratione decreto et aliis premissis pacifice gaudere, non permittentes eum desuper per quoscunque quomodolibet indebite molestari. . . . Tho. de Binis.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1203, f. 15^b f.]

39. PARIS DE GRASSIS ABOUT THE CARDINAL
RAFFAELLO RIARIO.*

De rev^{mo} card^{li} s. Georgii decano collegii. Postquam rev. cardinalis s. Georgii ex castro s. Angeli reductus ad consistorium et ibi absolutus a poena in qua condemnatus et privatus fuerat ut supra scripsi, ipse semper mansit in palatio in altis cameris supra cameras papae, unde aliquando et ad placitum suum veniebat ad papam et similiter cum eo colloquebatur amice et domestice ac etiam cum papa extra palatium et sine eo nunc cum isto cardinali nunc cum alio per prata et suburbanas vineas spatibatur semper se obedientissimum exhibens, ita ut papa gratiosius magis quotidie sibi videretur, et accedente festo s. Augustini, cuius ordinis ipse est protector, papa concessit ut simul cum aliis cardinalibus multis iret ad missam illius diei solemnem et sic ivit et rediit ad palatium papae simul cum aliis palatinis cardinalibus licet diceret ipsum potuisse accedere ad palatium suum per illam diem; deinde cum papa per mensem et ultra recessisset extra urbem ad Viterbium et loca illa ut sui moris est qualibet aestate spatiari, etiam concessit eidem cardinali ut secum iret si vellet et sic ivit cum aliis venantibus et aucupantibus. Deinde papa dedit sibi licentiam ut ad urbem si vellet rediret etiam ad palatium suum diverteret prout divertit, ubi pro me misit ac enixe rogavit ut si possem eum adiuvarem, scit enim me esse amicum, servitorem et tantum sui honoris cupidum sicut alium quemcunque affinem suum ac etiam quia scit qualiter papa mihi fidem praestat et auctoritatem citra iactantiam loquendo. Itaque ego cum primum papa fuit reversus accessi et caute loquendo de variis dixi sibi, quod ex quo consistorium publicum in proximo instabat pro receptione trium nevorum cardinalium et card^{lis} s. Crucis qui debabat dicere missam in die omnium sanctorum tanquam episcopus cardinalis non volebat eam dicere quia ipse erat decanus collegii sed bene volebat in publico consistorio benedicere novos cardinales sicut alios benedixerat et me respondisse sibi quod ex quo card^{lis} s. Georgii est reversus ad domum suam et iam ivit cum cardinalibus ad missam s. Augustini et simul cum aliis cardinalibus interfuit receptioni cardinalis Grosse-

* See *supra*, pp. 178, 192.

tani qui accessit ad papam Viterbii existentem, quod nunc si dictus cardinalis s. Georgii excluderetur a consistorio et ipse non benediceret istis novis cardinalibus quod profecto fieret sibi iniuria et quod ego credebam quod papa non esset ita turbatus contra cardinalem ipsum ut ipsum excludat, quo autem ad missam omnium sanctorum si ipse cardinalis s. Crucis non vellet eam cantare quod ego dicerem papae ut eam consignet card^{li} s. Georgii episcopo Ostiensi qui eam cantabit libenter ut credo. Itaque cum ego omnia haec narrata per me cardinali s. Crucis retulissem papae ipse dixit mihi me optime dixisse cardinali s. Crucis et quod ex quo cardinalis s. Georgii prudenter et humiliter in omnibus se exhibebat quae papa ei imposuit quod vult ut omnino veniat ad consistorium publicum et faciat officium benedictionis super cardinalibus novis et non alius et quod etiam volebat quod idem cantaret missam in die omnium sanctorum tanquam amicus et conciliatus secum si modo ipse cardinalis vellet cantare. Itaque mihi papa imposuit ut irem et haec eidem cardinali referrem prout retuli, qui ita contentus et laetus fuit ut me pluries amplexus fuerit cum mille osculationibus et acceptavit cantare missam pro quibus duabus gratiis agebat infinitas gratias S. S^u prout ego reversus ad papam exposui ac etiam subdidi quod S. S^{us} posset eundem cardinalem restituere ad vocem activam et passivam vel saltem ad vocem consultativam in consistorio secreto, papa subdens dixit me esse parum expertum in talibus quia nullus cardinalis haberet in consistorio vocem decisivam nisi papa et quod cardinales habent solum consultativam quia papa quando aliquid proponit dicit nos sic intendimus facere et cardinales respondent placet et similia et sic risit me dimittens cum aliquali spe quod infra pauca consistoria remitteret ei votum activum et passivum. Haec sic ad longum volui scribere quia tota curia fuerit admirata de liberatione ista tali quali et praesertim quod ego fuerim is qui ita simpliciter conduxerim factum istud.

[Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Rossiana Library, Vienna, and
Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, XII., 23.]

40. PARIS DE GRASSIS ABOUT THE INTERCESSORY PROCESSIONS
FOR THE CRUSADE, ON 14TH MARCH, 1518.*

Dominica die de rosa fuit processio sanctissima et devotissima ad quam Papa exivit hora decima tertia, et ego interrogavi an deliberrasset omnino ire sine planellis et sine sotularibus et levato pede ostendit mihi se esse in scapinis absque sotularibus et absque planellis quod ego illico intimavi cardinalibus ex quibus multi idem illico fecerunt: seniores vero et qui male sani erant veniam a Pontifice petierunt et sic ut prius remanserunt. Pontifex paratus benedixit rosam ut alias et eam pedester portans ad capellam parvam consignari feci uni clerico camerae, qui ab inde ad ecclesiam de Minerva portavit ante papam. Papa autem facta oratione ante sacramentum in cappella parva cantavit ex libro letanias devotissime, et cum fletu irrigante a principio Chyrieleison usque ad versum sancte Paule ora pro nobis et cum dixit versum sancte Petre geminavit illum tum surgens et procedens semper cantoribus cantantibus respondebat per eosdem versus plena voce idem dicens prout illi cantabant, quod cardinalibus et praelatis significavi, et ipsi similiter fecerunt et dixerunt, quae fuit maxima devotio; cum pervenit ad altare Sancti Petri genuflexus reassumpsit versum "ut regibus" etc., prout supra et cantavit devotissime; tum finitis per cantores letaniis papa "veni creator spiritus" et sic surgens venit ad plateam et per vias omnes usque ad Minervam in quibus viis erant 15 altaria equis spatiis distantia inter se, plena sanctissimis reliquiis, ante quae singula papa in terra pulverulentissima genuflexit cum omni devotione non expectans cussinos aut tapetia sicut mos est in talibus. Bone Deus quantus populus utriusque sexus est, non credidissem fuisse tantum populum in tota Italia; et quidem omnia loca plena devotionis et pietatis. In scalis sancti Petri erant ex officialibus digniores et ut processio papalis pertransibat, sic ipsi officiales sequebantur ordine quisque suo usque ad portam Minervae, ubi conservatores cum senatore expectarunt et acceperunt baldacchinum quod fuit de ipsis sic ordinatum ne fieret aliqua rixa cum oratoribus ut mos est eorum. Papa in ianua osculatus est crucem, aspersus et incensatus est et quia ante chorum hinc inde erant quatuor tabernacula vid. salvatoris, sanctae Mariae Maioris, sancti Ioannis Baptistae et sanctae Mariae in Porticu,

* See *supra*, p. 232.

papa ut prius in nuda humo devotissime genuflexus diutius oravit ante unamquamquam imaginem, et non accepit in ianua rosam ne impediretur propter illam in orationibus, perveniens ad altare oravit; tum divertit ad claustrum fratrum in quo parumper moratus mutavit camisiam et revestitus est ac ad missam rediit cum rosa in manibus; eam missam cantavit cardinalis Cavalicensis cum orationibus quinque, videlicet de rosa, de sancto Spiritu, de nimis pressuris, de pace et contra paganos; elevato calice retraxit se celebrans ad cornu epistolae, ubi genuflexus mansit, quoad papa similiter genuflexus cantavit devotissime versiculos et orationes ut infra, quibus finitis papa retrocessit et continuata est missa usque ad finem, et data benedictione papali electus Carpentaratensis, qui erat secretarius papae, venit quidem in cappa oraturus, sed papa voluit quod esset paludatus et mitratus orans: sicque sermo factus est quamvis multum non intellectus propter exilitatem vocis naturalis, ab aliis alioquin doctus et eo finito cardinalis de Farnesio prior diaconorum in cappa sua ut erat accepta bulla e manibus papae ivit ad pulpitem ubi nuper ille oravit et stans legit ex minuta continentia bullae super expeditione contra Turcas, qua bulla finita papa cantavit Tedeum laudamus et in fine versiculos infrascriptos cum oratione ut ibidem; et haec quidem facta et dicta sunt omnia me ordinante sic ut supra: et cappellam paravi inter tribunam principalem hinc et chorum fratrum inde, sic ut ad altare esset adherens cancellis tribunae et solium papae esset versus sacristiam, cardinales hinc a solio inde ad altare, subsellia praelatorum versus cappellam sancti Thomae Aquinatis, versis illi renibus et alia more solito et erat hora xx sonata quando haec finita sunt. . . .

[Paris de Grassis, *Diarium, Sec. Arch. of the Vatican,
XII., 23.]

41. POPE LEO X. TO THE GRAND DUKE VASIL OF MOSCOW.*

1518, Juni 4, Rom.

Leo episcopus servus servorum Dei. Dilecto filio nobili viro Basilio magno totius Russie et Moschovie principi potentissimo salutem et apostolicam ben. Sumus prepositi a Domino Deo nostro per illius inscrutabilem providentiam universo generi fidelium

* See *supra*, p. 238.

suorum, qui sunt vocati ad repromissionem vitae aeternae, ut pastoris vigilis vel potius pii pastoris amore atque animo illorum salutem sedulo procuremus, quae cum in duabus rebus maxime consistat, ut pacem inter se et caritatem conservent et ut ab impetu et rabie infidelium Christi hostium defendantur, nos utramque hanc curam perpetuamque sollicitudinem animo gerentes et nunc quidem precipue immanissimorum Turcarum maximis successibus, quantum Dominus concesserit, cupientes obsistere, ne illius potentia in generalem perniciem non solum Christianitatis verum etiam aliorum quorumcunque hominum evadat, elegimus dil^m filium Nicolaum de Schomberghe [sic] ordinis predicatorum, cuius hominis virtuti ac prudentie plurimum confidimus et quem ad magnas res tractandas adhibere sumus soliti, nuperque ad carissimos in Christo filios nostros Cesarem, Francie, Hispanie, Anglie Reges misimus. Et nunc iterum ei mandavimus, ut ad ipsum Cesarem et ad te aliosque nonnullos reges et principes se conferret tecumque alia quaedam et ut arbitramur ad tuum quoque honorem et commodum unionemque Christianarum rerum ac sectarum pertinentia consilia nostra nostro nomine communicaret. Hortamur igitur nobilitatem tuam in Domino et pro affectu animi nostri erga te valde requirimus, ut eum libenter et amice audiens nos ipsos tecum existimes illo loquente loqui eamque fidem illi habeas, quam nobis haberes. Et si quid animum tuum movet, quem et nobilem et generosum esse intelleximus, nostra in te paterna benivolentia, qui, quod cum tuo incremento dignitatis et salute tua perpetua fiat, cupimus vehementer, et Deum tibi et te illius sanctissimae fidei esse propitium, in iis, quae tecum communicaverit, et promptum te et benivolum ostendas, quod erit nobis summopere gratum. Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum anno incarnationis dominice mill^{mo} quingent^{mo} decimo octavo, pridie junii, pontificatus nostri anno sexto. Albergatus.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1194, f. 225.]

42. POPE LEO X. TO THE PRINCES OF TARTARY.*

1518, Juni 4, Rom.

Leo episcopus servus serv. Dei. Illustri Tartarorum principi timorem divini nominis et amorem. Esti id quod maxime

* See *supra*, p. 238.

cuperemus nondum factum est, ut simus tecum non solum humana sed celesti amicitia conjuncti, tamen cum assiduas preces ad Deum et Dominum nostrum fundamus, ut te talem et tam aegregium [sic] principem ad suorum electorum numerum aggregare dignetur, spem habemus in illius infinita clementina, nos te aliquando simul cum multis maximis Christianitatis regibus carissimi in Christo filii loco habituros. Sed donec quidem hoc divinum nobis advenerit bonum, nihil prohibet interea, quin, que communem nobis tecum securitatem et salutem adversus nimiam et cupiditatem et potentiam Turcarum principis contineat, humana inter nos amicitia jungamur. Nam et tu is princeps es, sicut intelligimus, ut et prudentia et virtute polleas, et nos tales esse cupimus, ut amicitia nostra tibi et utilitati et ornameto esse possit. Quare hoc animo volentes, eligimus dilectum filium Nicolaum Sconbeghe [sic] ordinis praedicatorum, cuius hominis virtuti et prudentie plurimum confidimus et quem ad magnas res tractandas adhibere sumus soliti, nuperque ad carissimos in Christo filios nostros Cesarem, Francie, Hispanie, Anglie reges etiam misimus, et nunc iterum ei mandavimus, ut ad ipsum Caesarem et ad te aliosque nonnullos reges et principes se conferret, tecumque alia quaedam, ut arbitramur, ad tuum quoque honorem et commodum, ut speramus pertinentia consilia nostra nostro nomine communicaret. Hortamur igitur et pro affectu animi nostri erga te valde requirimus, ut eum libenter et amice audiens nos ipsos tecum existimes illo loquente loqui, eamque fidem illi habeas, quam nobis haberes. Quod erit nobis summopere gratum et tibi ut quotidie magis cognosces salutare et honorificum. Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum anno incarnationis Dominice millesimo quingentesimo decimo octavo pridie nonas junii, pontificatus nostri anno sexto. Albergatus.

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1194, f. 226.]

43. POPE LEO X. TO CARDINAL RAFFAELLO RIARIO.*

1518, Juni 28, Rom.

Leo gives him permission: die crastina, que erit festivitas beator. Petri et Pauli, in maiori altari Basilice principis Aposto-

* See *supra*, p. 193.

lorum de Urbe missam et alia divina officia etiam in presentia nostra celebrandi. . . .

[Sec. Arch. of the Vatican, Regest. Vat. 1194, f. 235.]

44. BALDASSARE CASTIGLIONE TO THE MARQUIS OF
MANTUA.*

1519, Juni 5, Rom.

. . . Qui se parla più che d'ogni altra cosa di questo futuro imperio, et opinione de molti è che non debba cascare ne in Francia ne in Spagna, pur ogni cosa è in confuso. Li Francesi non parlano sì largamente di questo come faceveno prima. Monsig. della Rochia è gionto qui dui dì sono, ma non ha parlato a N. S^{re} prima che questa matina e per quanto dimostra la sua instructione, la quale è venuta dui dì prima nelle mani del papa, che esso sia gionto, non porta altro se non che el Christianissimo se condole con N. S. della morte del duca Lorenzo con tutto el cuore et offerisce a Sua B^{ne} el stato, la persona etc., e quando a quella piaccia di exaltare qualchun altro della casa sua, mostra volerli dare ogni aiuto possibile; potrebbe essere ch'egli habbia qualchaltra commissione a bocha più secreta, la quale io insino a qui non ho intesa. Dicesi che la armata del re catholico per mare molto grosso è uscita del porto de Carthagene indrizata alla via de Sicilia e sopra di questo variamente si ragiona. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

* See *supra*, p. 287.

INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL VII.

- ABISCIOLATIS, Franc. de, 473.
 Acciaiuoli, Roberto, 95, 123.
 Accolti, Cardinal, 15, 21, 129,
 174, 177, 387, 396 n.,
 397 *seq.*, 452, 462, 479,
 482.
 d'Acunha, Tristan, 74.
 Adelmann von Adelmans-
 felden, Bernhard, 407, 408,
 410.
 Adimaro, Filippo, 485.
 Adorni, Family of the, 52.
 Adrian of Utrecht, Cardinal
 (Bishop of Tortosa, after-
 wards Pope Adrian VI.),
 7, 8, 198 n., 204, 322, 342.
 Ægidius of Viterbo, *see* Canisio.
 Agen, Bishop of, Cardinal, *see*
 Rovere, Leonardo Grosso
 della.
 Agillaria, Franc. de, 472.
 Agnello, Carlo, 107 n.
 Agostini, Paolo, 185 n.
 Albert of Brandenburg (Arch-
 bishop of May-
 ence), 264, 278,
 285, 298, 329
 seq., 332, 343-
 346, 351 *seq.*,
 361, 391, 396,
 398, 416, 421,
 435.
 ,, ,, (Grand Master of
 the Teutonic
 Order), 45.
 Albizzi, Andrea degli, 485.
 ,, Angelo Girolamo degli,
 177 n.
 d'Albret, Cardinal, 73 n.
 Aleander, Hieronymus, 5, 67,
 328, 404 *seq.*, 407, 416,
 417, 419-430, 432-441.
 Alessandro, Cardinal, *see*
 Farnese.
 Alexander II., Pope, 335 n.
 ,, VI., Pope, 16, 21,
 29, 41, 89, 137,
 198 n., 212, 310.
 Alexiis, Ant. de, 476.
 Alfonso I., Duke of Ferrara,
 36, 38, 68, 144, 163, 166
 n., 168, 196 n., 209, 223,
 263, 448, 464, 465.
 Alfonso, Infant of Portugal,
 Cardinal, 201.
 Alidosi, Francesco (Bishop of
 Pavia), Cardinal, 149.
 Almadianus, Galienus, 473.
 Altobellus (Bishop of Pola), *see*
 Averoldo.
 Amboise, George d' (Arch-
 bishop of Rouen), Cardinal,
 97.
 Ancona, Cardinal of, *see*
 Accolti.
 Angeli, Neapolionus, 473.
 Anselmo, Frate, 34 n., 35 n.
 Anselmo Thome (of Narni),
 483.
 Antonio di San Marino, 41.

- Appiani, the (of Piombino), 91.
 „ Jacopo V., 91 n.
 d'Aragona, Luigi, Cardinal, 15, 23, 36, 81, 196.
 Arcimboldi, Giovanni Angelo, 329 *seq.*, 350.
 Arcionus, Jo., 472.
 Ardinghello, Pietro, 85, 86, 275, 282.
 Ariosto, Lodovico, 187 n., 343.
 Aristophilus (medicus), 473.
 Arles, the Archbishop of, 73 n.
 Armellini, Francesco, Cardinal, 191 n., 202, 332, 467.
 Arnold von Tugern, 321.
 Astallis, Marianus de, 474.
 Attono, Philip, 474, 476.
 Austone, Jo. Ant., 479.
 Averoldo, Altobello (Bishop of Pola), 221 *seq.*, 475, 478, 486.

 BAGLIONI, Giampaolo, 18.
 Bainbridge, Christopher, Cardinal, 16, 45, 55, 59.
 Bakócz, Thomas (Archbishop of Gran), Cardinal, 16, 19, 21, 24, 214, 455.
 Baldassare, 202.
 Baldassare da Pescia, 76, 77 n., 96 n., 98 n., 215 n.
 Ballis, Bened. de, 474, 475, 476.
 Bandinelli, Baccio, 130.
 Baraballo of Gaeta, 76.
 Baumgärtner, 407 n.
 Bayard, 114.
 Beatrice da Ferrara, 91 n.
 Beltrandi, Guillelmus, 477.
 Bembo, Pietro, Cardinal, 47, 89, 97, 100, 106 n., 150 n., 182.
 Benassao, Latino, 164.
 Bentivogli, Family of the, 44, 116, 133.

 Beriszlo, Petrus, Ban of Croatia and Bishop of Veszprim, 215, 217.
 Berthold of Ratisbon, 338 n.
 Bianchi, Giulio de', 173, 465.
 Bibbiena, Antonio, 103 n.
 „ (Bernardo Dovisi), Cardinal, 24, 29, 36, 43, 53, 64 n., 81, 82, 84 *seq.*, 97, 99, 103, 107, 109, 111 n., 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 127, 136, 139, 150 n., 152, 169, 231, 237, 240 *seq.*, 259 *seq.*, 263, 266 *seq.*, 269, 274 *seq.*, 277, 479.
 „ Pietro, 47.
 Blondus, Franc., 472.
 „ Paulus, 475, 479.
 Bodmann, Karl von, 327.
 Boissy, Adrien Gouffier de (Bishop of Constances), Cardinal, 139.
 „ Arthur Gouffier de, 125 n.
 Bonellus, Dom., 473.
 Bongianus, Matheus, 476.
 „ Thomas, 476.
 Boniface VIII., Pope, 335.
 „ IX., Pope, 336 n., 338, 339 *seq.*
 Boninsegna, Ant., 473.
 Bonjoannes, Ant. Jacobus (Bishop of Camerino), 475, 486.
 Bonnivet, Admiral, 129, 139, 451 *seq.*
 Bonomo, Pietro (Bishop of Trieste), 70, 451.
 Boschetti, Roberto, 283 n.
 Boscoli, the, 43.
 Bosseus, Dom., 473.
 Boulogne, Comte de, *see* Jean.

- Bourbon, Catherine de, 228.
 „ Charles, Duke of
 (The Constable),
 139, 140, 149 n.
 „ Louis de, Cardinal,
 201.
- Bramante, 3.
- Brancha, Franc., 472.
- Branconio, Battista, 75.
- Brandenburg, Elector of, *see*
 Joachim.
- Briçonnet, Cardinal, 73 n.
 „ Dionys. (Bishop of
 St. Malo), 228,
 487.
- Bronsini, Marcus, 471.
- Bruck, Gregor, 429 n.
- Bucchanus, Perseus, 477.
- Burkhard, Peter, 409.
- Busch, Johann, 314.
- Busche, Hermann van dem,
 317, 423.
- Bussa, Marianus, 473.
- CADICHIUS, Jo. Bapt. (Bishop
 of Sulmona), 475.
- Cafarellus, Jo. Petrus, 474.
- Cajetan (Thomas de Vio),
 Cardinal, 205, 237, 238 n.,
 244 *seq.*, 248 *seq.*, 252, 258,
 268, 272 *seq.*, 280, 286,
 289 n., 349, 366-380, 381
 n., 387, 397, 401, 418 n.
- Callixtus III., Pope, 309.
- Campeggio, Lorenzo, Cardinal,
 62, 63, 196 n., 204, 231,
 237 *seq.*, 240, 242 *seq.*, 417 n.
- Canisio, Egidio, Cardinal, 10,
 143, 153, 205 *seq.*, 219,
 231, 237 *seq.*, 253, 276,
 342, 469.
- Cantacusanus, Hercules, 477.
- Canossa, Ludovico di (Bishop
 of Bayeux), 63 n., 98, 100,
 108, 109, 118, 123, 124,
 126, 145 n., 154, 163, 166
 n., 210.
- Capiteferreo, Raimundus de,
 477.
 „ Stephanus de,
 472.
- Capocci, Rainer., 473.
- Capranica, Dominici Ang. Ant.
 de, 471.
- „ Joannes Rose de,
 471.
- „ Nicolas de, 477.
- Caprarola, Jo. Bapt. Petr. de,
 471.
- „ Tiberius Jo. de, 471.
- Caprili, Giuliano, 147 n., 150
 n., 197 n.
- Caracciolo, M., 244 n., 285,
 416, 417, 421, 430, 432,
 436, 438.
- Caramelli, Ludovico, 483.
- Carben, Victor, 320.
- Cardona (Viceroy of Naples),
 32, 49, 60 n., 64, 114.
- Cardulo, Bernardo, 486.
- Carlstadt, 407.
- Carosis, Andrea de, 474.
 „ Justino de, 182.
- Caroz, 285, 288.
- Carpi, *see* Pio.
- Carretta, Franc., 477.
- Carretto, Fabrizio de, 221.
- Carretto da Finale, Carlo
 Domenico del, Cardinal,
 15, 17, 21.
- Carronibus, Marius de, 474.
- Carvajal, Bernardino Lopez de,
 Cardinal (of Santa Croce),
 17, 44, 54, 56, 57, 58, 222,
 322, 399, 448, 449, 479,
 482.
- Casalius, Raph., 474.
- Casanova, Marcantonio, 41 n.
- Castellanus, Petrus Paulus,
 474.
- Castellesi, Adriano, Cardinal,
 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 128,
 179, 180, 182, 186 *seq.*,
 195 *seq.*, 460, 461, 464.

- Castiglione, Baldassare, 89,
286, 288, 289 n., 496.
Casulano, Antonio, 424 n.
Cavalariis, Dominicus de, 472.
Cechinus, Domitius, 472.
Cecius, Julianus, 476.
Cesarini, Aless., Cardinal, 204.
,, Giovan Giorgio, 37.
Cesi, Paolo Emilio, Cardinal,
204.
Challand, Robert, Cardinal, 16,
66.
Charles V. (of Spain, afterwards
Emperor), 158 n.,
159, 160, 161, 204,
209, 229 *seq.*, 239,
249, 252 *seq.*, 257,
259-262, 264-267,
270-281, 283-287,
289-291, 312, 323,
367, 417, 419 *seq.*,
425-457, 482.
,, VIII. (King of France),
137.
,, the Bold (Duke of
Burgundy), 313.
Chièvres, M. de, 459.
Chigi, Agostino, 39 n., 41, 189,
190.
Christian (King of Denmark),
233.
Cibo, Franceschetto, 82.
,, Innocenzo, Cardinal, 81,
82, 136, 139, 188, 482.
Cinciis, Virgilius, de, 474.
Cingulo, Petrus de, 477.
Cintio da Tivoli, 118, 119.
Ciocchi del Monte, Antonio (of
Sansovino), Cardinal, 15,
23, 398, 399 n., 482, 485.
Ciolek, Erasmus Vitellius
(Bishop of Plock), 246 n.,
265, 266, 268, 274 *seq.*
Clement VI., Pope, 374.
,, VII., Pope, 8, 9, 10;
see Medici, Giulio,
de.
Cochläus, Johannes, 316.
Colecta, Dominico, 478, 483.
Cologne, The Elector of, *see*
Wied.
Colonna, Family of the, 18 n.,
38, 466.
,, Fabrizio, 45.
,, Marcantonio, 32 n.,
152, 154.
,, Muzio, 158.
,, Pompeo, Cardinal,
44, 204.
,, Prospero, 115, 158,
459.
Conti, Family of the, 38.
,, Francesco, Cardinal, 204.
Contreras, Bernardino de, 475.
Coptius, Petrus, 478.
Corbaira, Count of, 218 n.
Cordella, Joh., 473.
,, Petrus, 473.
Cornaro [Cornelius], Marco,
Cardinal, 16, 23, 24 n., 81,
120, 122, 222, 460, 464,
465, 482, 485.
Corradinis, Paulo de, 486.
Corte, Ercole de, 196 n.
Cosciaris, Lucentius de, 477.
,, Marcus de, 474.
Costa, Benedictus, 477.
,, Petr., Franc. de, 476.
Costabili, Beltrando de, 144 n.,
148 n., 173 n., 176 n., 181
n., 196 n., 200 n., 464,
465.
Crescentii, Hieron. de, 473.
Croatia, The Ban of, *see* Beriszlo.
Cupis, Giandomenico de, Car-
dinal, 204.
Cusa, Nicholas of, Cardinal,
304.
DADO, Hieron., 487.
Dalheim, Johann von, 344.
Darius, Silvester, 239 n
Decio, Filippo, 29.
Didacus de Acre, 477.

- Dolzegk, Johann, 407.
 Donatus (apost. notary), 476.
 Döring, Matthias, 308.
 Dovisi, Bernardo, *see* Bibbiena.
 Draco, Antonius, 473.
 Du Prat, Antoine Bohier, Cardinal, 125, 126 n., 136, 216, 237 n.
- Eck, Johann, 327, 341, 351 n., 360, 364 n., 383, 386, 394, 403 n., 404 *seq.*, 406-411, 413 *seq.*, 416, 418 *seq.*
 Ecken, Johann von der, 433.
 Eichstätt, Bishop of, *see* Eyb.
 Emmanuel the Great (King of Portugal), 74, 77, 214, 217, 223, 229, 482.
 Emser, Jerome, 341.
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 315 *seq.*, 323, 399 n., 413, 422 *seq.*, 424.
 Erbach, Dietrich von (Archbishop of Mayence), 309.
 Ernest of Bavaria (Bishop of Passau), 412.
 d'Este, The Family, 44.
 „ Ippolito, Cardinal, 81, 135, 147 n.
 „ Isabella (Marchioness of Mantua), 446.
 Eugenius IV., Pope, 132.
 Evangeliste, Franciscus, 472.
 Eyb, Gabriel von (Bishop of Eichstätt), 410, 413.
- FABIUS, Ant. de, 474.
 „ Franc. de, 473.
 „ Honofr. de, 474.
 Falk, Peter, 23 n., 26, 329 n.
 Faria, Juan de, 75.
 Farnese, Alessandro, Cardinal, 16, 25, 33, 174, 177, 180, 222, 231, 237, 245, 460, 462, 464, 482.
 Ferdinand I. (King of Hungary and Bohemia), 161, 273 n.
- Ferdinand II., *The Catholic* (King of Aragon), 27, 50, 66, 92, 93, 99, 103, 128 n., 142, 144, 257.
 Ferdinandus de Acre, 476.
 Ferrara, Duke of, *see* Alfonso.
 Ferreri, Bonifacio, Cardinal, 203.
 „ Zaccaria, 73 n.
 Ficino, Marsilio, 29.
 Fieschi, Niccolò, Cardinal [Flisco], 15, 16, 21, 135, 222, 399 n., 460, 479, 482.
 Filiberta of Savoy, 106, 107 n., 150.
 Filonardi, Ennio, 93 n., 110, 143, 155 n., 159.
 Finale, Cardinal, *see* Carretto.
 Fine, Cornelius de, 53 n., 121 n., 129 n., 131 n., 141 n.
 Flisco, Cardinal de, *see* Fieschi.
 Flores, Petrus, 19.
 Foix, Odet de, *see* Lautrec.
 „ Thomas de, *see* Lescun.
 Forbin de Solier, Louis, 67, 71, 111 n.
 Foscari, Francesco, 47, 61, 62.
 Francesco Maria (Duke of Urbino), *see* Rovere.
 Francis I. (King of France), 106-109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 117-119, 122 *seq.*, 129, 134-144, 145, 147 *seq.*, 151, 152, 154 *seq.*, 157-159, 161 *seq.*, 166, 188, 195, 209 *seq.*, 216 *seq.*, 221, 227-229, 239 *seq.*, 249, 252, 257 *seq.*, 262 *seq.*, 266 *seq.*, 269 *seq.*, 273-280, 283 *seq.*, 287, 420, 458, 487.
 Frangipani, Ant. de, 473.
 „ Jacobus de, 474.
 Fregoso, F., 63 n.
 „ Ottaviano, 52.
 Frederick III., *The Emperor*, 306, 312.

- Frederick III. (Elector of Saxony), 258, 262, 267, 272, 277, 280, 284 *seq.*, 289, 367, 370-372, 378, 381, 385 *seq.*, 396, 398, 406, 410, 413, 421 *seq.*, 425-428, 432.
- Fugger, Family of the, 331.
- „ Jakob, 273 n., 331, 345.
- Fulginas, Fed. Flavius, 476.
- GABBIONETA, Alessandro, 35 n., 55 n., 134 n., 139 n., 448, 449, 459.
- Gadio, Stazio, 135 n., 446.
- Gaetani, Family of the, 38.
- Galeatius Poeta, 473.
- Gallus, Paulus, 472.
- Gambara, Giacomo da, 116, 155 n.
- Gargiis, Joh. Bapt. de, 71.
- Gattinara (The Chancellor), 428, 430.
- Geiler von Kaisersberg, 302, 336, 337.
- Gelnhausen, Conrad von, 308.
- Gemmingen, Uriel von (Archbishop of Mayence), 330.
- Gentilis, Alexander, 473.
- George of Bavaria (Bishop of Spire), 321.
- „ Duke of Saxony, 327, 430.
- Georgio, Cardinal di S., *see* Riario, Raffaello.
- Gerson, John, 308.
- Gheri [Gherio, Ghersio], Goro (Bishop of Pistoia), 93 n., 95 n., 144 n., 283.
- Ghinucci, Girolamo (Bishop of Ascoli), 363, 366, 368, 377.
- Ghisius, Aug., 481.
- Gianfigliuzzi, Jacopo, 130.
- Giocondo da Verona, Fra, 89.
- Giorgi, Marino, 121, 122, 123.
- Giovio [Jovius], Paolo, 40, 43, 50, 51, 141, 187, 192 n.
- Giustiniani, Seb., 160 n.
- Glapion, 430.
- Gonzaga, Agostino, 156 n., 456.
- „ Elisabetta, 150.
- „ Federigo, 165.
- „ Francesco (Marquis of Mantua), 60 n., 139 n., 155, 447 *seq.*, 456, 496.
- „ Isabella, *see* Este, Isabella.
- „ Sigismondo, Cardinal, 16, 22, 23, 38, 447.
- Gouffier de Boissy, *see* Boissy.
- Gozadinis, Johannes de, 468.
- „ Matheus, 473.
- Granacci, Francesco, 130.
- Grassis, Achille de, Cardinal, 15, 222, 464, 468, 479, 482.
- „ Paris de, 18, 25, 35, 36, 69, 73, 129, 131, 132, 135, 177, 178, 180, 183, 191, 193 *seq.*, 205, 450, 451, 463, 466 *seq.*, 490, 492.
- Gratia de Francia, Fra, 77 n.
- Gratus, Carolus, 473.
- Gregorius de Monte Calvello, 473.
- Gregory VII., St., Pope, 7, 10.
- Greiffenclau, Richard von (Elector of Treves), 278, 284, 421, 436 n.
- Grimani, Domenico, Cardinal, 15, 16, 17, 122, 157, 182 *seq.*, 321, 479, 482.
- Grossino, 136 n., 138 n.
- Guicciardini, Francesco, 8, 101, 102, 171, 212 n.
- Guise, Duke of, 111.
- Gusieri, Paolo, 177 n.
- HEIMBURG, Gregor, 309.

Heinrichmann, 411 n.
 Henneberg, Berthold von (Archbishop of Mayence), 311, 327.
 Henry VIII., King of England, 50, 53, 61 n., 65, 66, 98, 100, 118, 124, 128 n., 160, 188, 209 *seq.*, 221, 229, 239 *seq.*, 249, 276 n., 482.
 Hessus, Eobanus, 317.
 Hieronymus (auditor), 370 n.
 Hochstraten, Jakob, 319 *seq.*, 321-325.
 Hus, John, 311, 360, 401.
 Hutten, Ulrich von, 317, 318, 324, 328, 388 *seq.*, 416, 424, 432, 433 n.
 INNOCENT III., Pope, 232.
 „ VIII., Pope, 16, 28, 29, 85, 335.
 Isenburg, Diether von (Archbishop of Mayence), 309.
 Ismael, Shah, 226.
 JACOBazzi, Domenico, Cardinal, 204.
 Jannelli, Bernardinus, 471.
 Jean, Comte de Boulogne, 228.
 Joachim I. (Elector of Brandenburg), 259, 272, 277, 280 n., 286, 329, 430, 437.
 Joanninensis, Stefano, 132 n., 177 n.
 John (Administrator of Ratisbon), 411.
 John of Saxony, 406
 Jovius, *see* Giovio.
 Julius II., Pope, 3, 8, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26, 28, 31-33, 38, 41, 46, 49, 53, 55, 58, 60, 68, 73, 83, 132, 138 *seq.*, 149, 207, 212, 257, 260, 310, 328, 401, 446, 448, 453.
 Julius de Narnia, 476.

KAISERSBERG, *see* Geiler.
 Köllin, Conrad, 321.
 LADISLAS (King of Hungary), 216, 454.
 Lando, Pietro, 105 n.
 Landsberg, Johannes Justus von, 293 n.
 Lang, Matthæus, Cardinal, 65, 68 *seq.*, 96-98, 244, 331, 367, 412, 450.
 Langenstein, Heinrich von, 308.
 Lascaris, Giano, 127, 222 n.
 Lattes, Bonet de, 321.
 Lauredanus, Leonardus, 487.
 Lautrec, Odet de Foix, Vicomte de, 114, 134, 165.
 Leazariis, Camillus de, 473, 476.
 Lenis, Franc. de, 474.
 Leno, Giuliano, 39 n.
 Leo X., Pope, 3-7, 10, 25, 26-35, 36-48, 49-55, 57, 59 *seq.*, 65, 68, 70-77, 79 *seq.*, 85-88, 90-96, 97, 99-110, 112, 114-118, 120-126, 127 *seq.*, 129, 130-133, 136-143, 144, 145 *seq.*, 147 *seq.*, 150-160, 162-176, 177-184, 186-192, 194-199, 201 *seq.*, 207-224, 227, 231 *seq.*, 237, 240 *seq.*, 255-272, 274-288, 291, 321 *seq.*, 325, 328 *seq.*, 331, 342, 344, 358 n., 359 n., 361-364, 367, 372, 377, 379, 383, 385 *seq.*, 388, 405, 417, 423, 439, 446, 450, 452, 454, 456-459, 469, 488, 493, 494, 495; *see* Medici, Giovanni de'.
 Leonardo di Zanobi Bartholini, 39 n.
 Lescun, Thomas de Foix, Vicomte de, 228.
 Liège, Bishop of, *see* Mark.
 Lindner, Johann, 350.

- Link, Wenzel, 374, 378, 408.
 Lippomano, V., 103 n.
 Locher, Jakob, 63 n., 316,
 317.
 Lorraine, John of, Cardinal,
 241.
 Louis XI. (King of France),
 145 n.
 ,, XII. (King of France),
 27, 45, 47, 48, 54, 59,
 66 *seq.*, 93, 95, 98-
 106, 404.
 Louis of Hungary, 216, 233,
 454.
 Louisa of Savoy, 106, 151.
 Louise (daughter of Francis I.),
 159.
 Ludovico da Fermo, 448.
 Lupari, Gaspar, 473.
 ,, Marc. Ant., 473.
 Luther, Martin, 258, 291, 304
 seq., 316, 347, 351 *seq.*,
 353-360, 361-384, 385-
 400, 401-403, 405-408,
 410, 412-416, 419, 421
 seq., 424-432, 433-438.
 Lutiis, Philippus de, 472.
 Luxemburg, Phil., Cardinal of,
 240 n.
 Lyons, the Archbishop of, 73 n.

 MACHIAVELLI, 105.
 Magdalenus, Petrus, 474.
 Mantua, Marquis of, *see* Gon-
 zaga, Francesco.
 Marck, Robert de la, 114.
 Mark, Eberhard de la (Bishop
 of Liège), 248 n., 398,
 404.
 Marsilius of Padua, 308.
 Martin V., Pope, 132, 303.
 Martinellis, Blasius de, 18.
 Mary (daughter of Henry
 VIII.), 241.
 ,, (sister of Henry VIII.
 and wife of Louis
 XII.), 100.

 Matheus, Cyriacus, 475.
 ,, Julius, 472.
 ,, Palutius, 473.
 ,, Petrus Ant., 474.
 Maximilian I., The Emperor,
 17, 27, 49, 50, 60, 62-65,
 66, 71, 93, 96, 98, 101,
 103, 124, 143, 152-154,
 160 *seq.*, 167, 170, 219,
 229 *seq.*, 233, 244, 246,
 249, 252, 259, 261 *seq.*,
 264 *seq.*, 271 *seq.*, 310,
 321, 323, 344, 367, 370,
 418 n., 482.
 Maximis, Dominicus de, 474.
 Mayr, Martin, 297, 326.
 Mazatoste, Ricardus, 472.
 Mazzolini, Silvestro, *see* Prierias.
 Medici, Family of the, 27, 30,
 31, 33, 38, 43, 44,
 46, 79 *seq.*, 104, 123,
 137, 149, 159 n.,
 192, 215, 270, 471,
 480.
 ,, Alfonsina de', *see* Orsini.
 ,, Catherine de' (later,
 Queen of France),
 281, 284.
 ,, Contessina de', 44 n.
 ,, Floreta de', 81.
 ,, Giovanni de', Cardinal,
 15, 16, 17, 18, 21-
 26, 149, 447; *see*
 Leo X.
 ,, Giuliano de', 32, 33 n.,
 43, 47, 48, 66, 79,
 87 *seq.*, 91 n., 92,
 99, 101, 103, 106,
 107 n., 109 *seq.*, 127,
 133, 147 *seq.*, 150
 seq.
 ,, Giulio de', Cardinal
 (later, Pope Clement
 VII.), 43, 79 *seq.*,
 85, 92 n., 99, 108 n.,
 112, 116, 117, 128,
 132, 135, 136, 139,

Medici, Giulio de'—*continued* :

- 153 n., 188, 198 n.,
- 221 *seq.*, 227 *seq.*,
- 243, 259, 262 n.,
- 263 *seq.*, 266, 273,
- 280, 283, 289 n.,
- 386, 394, 405, 425,
- 440, 461, 468, 479.
- „ Ippolito de', Cardinal,
- 151 n.
- „ Lorenzo de', "The
- Magnificent," 22, 28,
- 79.
- „ Lorenzo de' (Duke of
- Urbino), 33 n., 36, 38,
- 44 n., 77 n., 79 *seq.*,
- 87 *seq.*, 98 n., 101,
- 111, 115 n., 117,
- 118 n., 120, 123,
- 127, 128, 132, 135,
- 147-149, 153 n.,
- 154 *seq.*, 157, 163-
- 165, 167, 169, 181,
- 211, 227, 240 *seq.*,
- 262, 265 *seq.*, 269
- seq.*, 273, 280 *seq.*
- 286, 459, 496.
- „ Maddalena de', 82.
- „ Piero de', 30, 79.
- „ Raffaello de', 418 n.
- Meyer, Petrus, 320.
- Miccinellus, Alexander, 474.
- Michael Angelo, 3, 83, 89.
- Mieres, Michael, 477.
- Milan, Duke of, *see* Sforza,
- Maximilian.
- Miltitz, Karl von, 286, 380-384,
- 385.
- Minio, Marco, 279, 288 *seq.*
- Minutulus, Gabriel, 476.
- Mirandola, *see* Pico.
- Monte, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
- Montebono, Fabius de, 474.
- Montefeltro, Federigo, 211.
- Montmaur, 109, 111 n.
- Morone, Girolamo, 49, 70, 158.
- Mostus, Perotius, 473.

Mumius, Marcus, 486.

Murner, Thomas, 341.

Mutianus, Conrad, 317, 324.

NARDI, Jacopo, 87.

Nerli, 43.

Neroni, Angelo, 451.

Nicholas V., Pope, 18.

Nicolosinus, Nic., 473.

Nider, Johannes, 302.

Nino, Marc Antonio, 172, 173,

174, 184, 460, 462, 465 *seq.*

Numai, Cristoforo, Cardinal,

197 n., 205 *seq.*, 358 n.

ODET DE FOIX, *see* Lautrec.

Oldecop, Johann, 346 n.

Orsini, Family of the, 17, 38,

466.

„ Alfonsina (mother of

Lorenzo de' Medici),

90 n., 91, 123, 148.

„ Camillo, 122 n.

„ Clarissa, 28.

„ Franciotto, Cardinal,

204, 461.

„ Gabriel (Bishop of

Calvi), 486.

„ Giovan Giordano, 45.

„ Onofrio, 476.

„ Renzo, 168.

„ Roberto Latino (Arch-

bishop of Reggio),

216, 278, 284 n.,

286, 454.

PACE, Richard, 276 n.

Pacheco, Diego, 75, 76.

„ Pedro, Cardinal, 341.

Palinus, Bapt., 474.

Pallavicini, Giambattista, Cardi-

nal, 204.

„ Franc., 477.

Pandolfini, Niccolò, Cardinal,

204.

Paolucci, Alfonso, 397 n., 398 n.

Passerini, Giulio, 130.

- Passerini, Silvio, Cardinal, 202
seq., 283.
 Paul V., Pope, 76.
 Pazzi, Family of, 178, 192.
 Perinus, Petrus, 473.
 Perusco, Mario de, 176, 182,
 190, 198 n., 199 n., 363,
 483, 486.
 Peruzzi, Baldassare, 202.
 Pesaro, Giacomo de, 196.
 Petrocchi, Elisei, 473.
 Petrucci, Alfonso, Cardinal, 16,
 23, 38, 170-176,
 177 n., 178, 180-
 187, 192, 194 *seq.*,
 208, 460, 462, 464,
 468.
 „ Borghese, 159 n., 171,
 174.
 „ Lattanzio, 172, 185 n.
 „ Raffaello (Bishop of
 Grosseto), 40, 159
 n., 171, 203, 466.
 Pfefferkorn, Johann, 319 *seq.*
 Philip (Bishop of Freising), 411.
 Picchi, Domin. de, 472.
 „ Hieron. de, 474.
 Piccolomini, Eneas Silvius de'
 (Pope Pius II.),
 297.
 „ Giovanni, Car-
 dinal, 204.
 „ Hieronimus, 486.
 Pico della Mirandola, Gian-
 francesco, 5, 6 n.
 Pio, Alberto, Count of Carpi,
 17, 22 n., 27, 28, 70, 152 n.,
 451, 478 *seq.*
 Piombo, Sebastiano del, 83.
 Pirkheimer, Willibald, 6 n., 407,
 408, 416.
 Pirstinger, Berthold (Bishop of
 Chiemsee), 293 n.
 Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal,
 201.
 Pius II., Pope, 304, 309, 401.
 Plock, Bishop of, *see* Ciolek.
 Pocointesta, 176, 180, 466.
 Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, 405.
 Poliziano, Angelo, 28.
 Pontorno, Jacopo da, 130.
 Ponzetti, Ferdinando, Cardinal,
 42, 202.
 Poppa, Giovanni da, 92.
 Possidarski, Stefano, 218 n.
 Prato, Giovanni Andrea, 48.
 Prie, René de (Bishop of Bay-
 eaux), Cardinal, 73 n.
 Prierias (Silvester Mazzolini),
 351 n., 363 *seq.*, 366, 377,
 378 n., 392.
 Pucci, Family of, 38.
 „ Antonio (Bishop of
 Pistoia), 158 n., 227
 „ Lorenzo, Cardinal, 82
seq., 129, 222, 343,
 396 n., 452, 479,
 482.
 „ Piero di Antonio, 82 n.
 Puppio, Gio. Batt. de, 358 n.
 QUATTRO CORONATI, Cardinal
 of the, *see* Pucci, Card.
 RAB, Hermann, 382.
 Rangoni, Annibale, 123 n.
 „ Ercole, Cardinal, 200
 n., 203, 467.
 „ Guido, 168.
 Raphael, 3, 18, 35, 75, 83, 89,
 235.
 „ of Volterra, 212 n.
 Rechberg, Philip von, 410.
 Remolino, Francesco, Cardinal,
 16, 45, 174, 177, 222, 460,
 462, 482.
 Renée (daughter of Louis XII.),
 93.
 Reuchlin, Johann, 319 *seq.*, 325,
 388, 424.
 Riario, Cesare (Patr. of Alex-
 andria), 475, 477,
 478, 485, 486.
 „ Galeatius, 486.

- Riario, Octavianus (Bishop of Viterbo), 475, 486.
 „ Raffaello, Cardinal, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 31 n., 59, 135, 177, 178, 180-182, 184, 185 n., 186-192, 193 *seq.*, 198 n., 396, 447, 460, 462, 464, 470 *seqq.*, 488, 490, 495.
 „ Thomas (Bishop of Savona), 486.
 Ridolfi, Luigi, 44 n.
 „ Niccolò (Bishop of Vicenza), Cardinal, 203, 467.
 Rogeriis, Jac. Ant. de, 472.
 „ Rosello de, 472.
 Roland (The Moor), 186 n.
 Rosellis, Rosello de, 472, 474.
 Rossi, Evangelista de', 42.
 „ Luigi de', Cardinal, 203.
 Rovere, Antonio della, 70, 451.
 „ Francesco Maria della (D. of Urbino), 36, 38, 114, 144, 147-151, 154-156, 157, 165 *seq.*, 168, 172 *seq.*, 182, 185 n., 186, 188, 194, 208 *seq.*, 217, 221, 448, 452 *seq.*, 456 *seq.*, 466.
 „ Leonardo Grosso della, Cardinal, 15, 21, 181, 189, 479, 482.
 „ Sisto Gara della, Cardinal, 15, 18, 198 n.
 Rubianus, Crotus, 324.
 SACCAZINO, Angelo, 479.
 Sadoletto, Jacopo, Cardinal, 76 n., 233, 235, 343.
 Salamonus, Hieron., 474.
 Saldonus, Jo. Bapt., 477.
 „ Roger, 477.
 Salviati, Family of the, 38.
 Salviati, Giovanni (Bishop of Fermo), Cardinal, 203.
 „ Jacopo, 38, 123 n., 164 n.
 Sances, Joh., 476.
 Sancta Cruce, Georgius de, 474.
 Sangallo, Antonio di, 39 n., 130.
 Sanseverino, Bastiano di, 98 n.
 „ Federigode, Cardinal, 44, 54, 57, 58, 67, 101, 118, 129, 135, 170, 448, 449.
 Sanson, Bernardine, 358 n.
 Sansoni, Hieronimus (Bishop of Arezzo), 475, 486.
 Sansovino, Cardinal, *see* Ciocchi.
 „ Jacopo, 130, 131.
 Santa Croce, Family of the, 38.
 „ Cardinal of, *see* Carvajal.
 Sarto, Andrea del, 130, 131.
 Sauli (Banker), 42.
 „ Bandinello, Cardinal, 15, 23, 81, 136, 174 *seq.*, 178, 180-182, 184, 185 n., 186-188, 193 *seq.*, 460, 462, 464, 465, 468, 470.
 Savelli, Family of the, 38.
 Savoy, Duke Charles of, 112, 118, 124, 237 n.
 Saxony, Elector of, *see* Frederick.
 Scappuccius, Marius, 474.
 Schaumburg, Silvester von, 389 *seq.*
 Schinner, Matthæus, Cardinal, 16, 22, 23, 45, 49, 53, 55, 59, 117, 119, 142, 143, 160, 164.
 Schönberg, Nicholas von (Archbishop of Capua), 167, 219, 238, 458, 494 *seq.*
 Schwarz, P., 341 n.
 Scotland, James, King of, 233.

- Selim I., The Sultan, 213, 217
seq., 227, 231, 253 n.
- Senilis, Gisbertus (Bishop of Rapolla), 475, 486.
- Serapica, Giovanni Lazzaro, 121, 173, 465.
- Serra, Jacopo, Cardinal, 16, 21.
 „ Berengerius, 476.
- Severus (monachus), 177 n.
- Seyssel, Claude de (Bishop of Marseilles), 66, 67, 71.
- Sforza, Ascanio Maria, Cardinal, 132.
 „ Francesco Maria (Duke of Bari), 70, 97 n., 451.
 „ Maximilian (Duke of Milan), 48, 49, 50, 52, 64, 67, 72, 97 n., 107, 110, 126, 417 n., 448, 451.
- Sickingen, Franz von, 325, 390, 432.
- Siena, Cardinal of, *see* Petrucci.
- Sigismund, The Emperor, 306.
 „ Duke (of the Tyrol), 309.
 „ King of Poland, 45, 217, 454.
- Silinon, Kaspar von, 156 n.
- Simi, Nicodemus, 471.
- Simoncinus, Jacobus, 477.
- Sindesio, Gentile (Pindaro), 61 n.
- Sinibaldi, Jo. Bapt. (Bishop of Osimo), 475.
 „ Prospero de, 472, 474.
- Sixtus IV., Pope, 16, 24, 192, 197, 310, 335.
- Soderini, Family of the, 38, 43, 44.
 „ Francesco, Cardinal, 15, 18, 23, 129, 179, 180, 184, 186 *seq.*, 195 *seq.*, 198 n., 447, 452, 461.
 „ Pietro, 43, 44 n., 187.
- Solier, de, *see* Forbin.
- Sozzini, Bartolomeo, 29.
- Spagnolo, Tolemeo, 459.
- Spalatin, 367, 376, 382 n., 390, 413.
- Spannocchi, Franc., 472.
- Spengler, Lazarus, 407, 408, 416.
- Speronibus, Vinc. de, 472, 474.
- Spinola, Aug. (Bishop of Perugia), 475, 477, 485 *seq.*
 „ Franc., 476, 486.
- Spïres, Bishop of, *see* George (of Bavaria).
- Spiritibus, Jo. Bapt de, 473.
- Spreca, Sebast., 473.
- Stadion, Christoph von (Bishop of Augsburg), 410 *seq.*
- Staffileo, Giovanni (Bishop of Serbenico), 210, 228.
- Staupitz, Johann von, 362, 373 *seq.*, 376.
- Strozzi, Family of the, 38.
 „ Filippo, 123 n., 125 n.
- Suleiman, The Sultan, 253 n.
- Supersaxo, Georg, 142, 143 n.
- TARTARY, the Princes of, 238, 494.
- Tesco [Theseo], Ugolino, 478, 483.
- Tetzel, Johann, 330, 345, 346 n., 347-351, 354-358, 363, 364 n., 382.
- Teutleben, Valentin von, 396.
- Theodorici, Jo. Bapt. de, 474.
- Theulis, Stephanus de, 473.
- Thomas de Vio, *see* Cajetan.
- Thomasius, Franc., 474.
- Tibaldeschi, Alb. de, 472.
- Tignosinus, Palinus, 473.
- Tizio, Sigismondo, 6, 7 n., 199, 350 n.
- Tornabuoni, Family of the, 38.
 „ G. (Bishop of Saluzzo), 176 n.
 „ Simon, 112 n.

- Tour d'Auvergne, Madeleine de la, 228, 240.
 Trémouille, Louis de la, 114, 134.
 Treves, Elector of, *see* Greiffenclau.
 Trissino, Giangiorgio, 153 n.
 Trithemius, The Abbat, 302.
 Trivulzio, Agostino, Cardinal, 191, 204, 467.
 „ Gianjacopo, 114, 115, 120.
 „ Scaramuccia, Cardinal, 204, 398.
 Truchsess, Canon, 321.
 URBINO, Duke of, *see* Rovere, Francesco Maria della.
 Urigiis, Hieron. de, 476.
 Urrea, Pedro (Bishop of Syracuse, Spanish Ambassador), 175, 479.
 VAGA, Perino del, 83, 130.
 Valle, Andrea della, Cardinal, 42, 204.
 „ Laur. Steph., 473.
 Varano, Giovanni Maria da, 36, 283 n.
 Vasari, Giorgio, 131 n.
 Vasili, Grand Duke of Moscow, 238, 493.
 Veccia, Petr. Paulus, 477.
 Venanzi, Ant., 476.
 „ Petr. Paul. (Bishop of Jesi [Esinus]), 475, 486.
 Vendôme, Duke of, 139.
 Vercelli, Battista da, 171, 172, 174, 175, 182-184, 186, 460, 465 *seq.*
 Vetera, Franc. de la, 472.
 Vettori, Francesco, 23, 105, 151, 156, 194 n., 228.
 Vich, Hieronymus de, 17, 45, 479.
 „ Raymond de, Cardinal, 201.
 Vigerio, Marco, Cardinal, 15.
 Vigili, Fabiano, 487.
 Vinci, Leonardo da, 90.
 Vio, Thomas de, *see* Cajetan.
 Virgilio, Marcello Adriani, 133 n.
 Vitelli, Giulio, 168.
 Vitellius, Erasmus, *see* Ciolek.
 Vlatten, Johann von, 248.
 Volta, Gabriele della, 361.
 „ Ant. della, 473.
 Volterra, Cardinal of, *see* Soderini, Franc.
 WALLACHIA, the Waiwodes of, 253 n.
 Wesel, Johann von, 311.
 Wied, Hermann von (Elector of Cologne), 278, 421.
 Wildenauer (Sylvius), Johann, 407.
 William of Reichenau, 341 n.
 Wimpeling, Jakob, 301 n., 302, 312, 327.
 Wimpina, 351 n., 355, 364 n.
 Wladislas, *see* Ladislas.
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 100, 118, 195, 239 *seq.*, 241-243, 256, 276 n.
 Wyclif, John, 360.
 XIMENES, Cardinal, 342.
 ZAMOMETIČS, Andrea [Zuccalmaglio, Archbp. of Carniola], 309.
 Zeccha, Jo. Ang. de la, 473.
 Zink, Johannes, 41.
 Zobel, Dietrich, 345.
 Zuccha, Hieron. Bern., 471, 472.
 Zurita, 27.

Date Due

46

D 19 '47

Ja 5 '48

19

APR 9 9 1977

11/18/1 1 E 1070

~~AUG 8 1979~~

Nov 30 1978

84-133


DEC 04 1990

~~JAN 31 '83~~



BW851.P294 V.7
The history of the popes, from the close

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00030 7944